School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1402124

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

To Michael Green

from

C. F. GROBECKER

London

28. Jan. 47

PAPERS

ON THE

Doctrine of the English Church

CONCERNING

THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

WORKS BY THE REV. N. DIMOCK.

MEMORIAL EDITION.

With an Introductory Note by the BISHOP OF DURHAM.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS IN RELATION TO THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES, TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES, AND UPHELD BY OUR REFORMERS. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

CHRISTIAN UNITY: Some Considerations on the Subject. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER: Two Lectures. With an Appendix on the Augmentation Theory. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

OUR ONE PRIEST ON HIGH; or, the Present Sacerdotal Function of Christ in Heaven: What it is not, and What it is. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER IN ITS BEARING ON PRESENT EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSIES. With a Preface Touching on the Ancillary Evidence of Contemporary Writings and Doings. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SACERDOTIUM, AS CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES AND TAUGHT IN OUR FORMULARIES. Crown 8vo, 2s. net.

RITUAL: ITS USE AND MISUSE; AND THREE PAPERS ON PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE. 2s. net.

THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST AS TAUGHT IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, CONSIDERED ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT. 2s. net.

PAPERS ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH CONCERNING THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE. Crown 8vo. 2 vols. 5s. net.

ON EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. Containing some Historical Notice of the Origin and Development of the Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, and of the Worship to which it has given rise. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA.

PAPERS

ON THE

Doctrine of the English Church

CONCERNING THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

BX
5149
C5
D56
1911
v.1

BY THE

REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A.

MEMORIAL EDITION

WITH AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY

THE RT. REV. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.

BISHOP OF DURHAM

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

1911

"*Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence.*" Originally published in pamphlet form by William Macintosh.
Collected and published in two volumes, "Memorial Edition," by Longmans, Green & Co., 1911.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

AUCKLAND CASTLE,
BISHOP AUCKLAND,
December 21st, 1909.

THIS Memorial Edition is inscribed to the memory of the Reverend Nathaniel Dimock, M.A., by friends and disciples to whom his name is at once dear and venerable. In him the grace of God combined in perfect harmony a noble force and range of mental power, an unshaken fidelity to conscience and Revelation, and a spirit beautiful with humility, peace and love.

" Remember your guides, who spoke unto you the Word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their walk of life."

H. DUNELM.

INTRODUCTION.

CONTROVERSY, in these days, is a necessity. To enter upon it from a love of controversy is not.

There is something very sad and humbling in the thought, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—the Communion of His Body and Blood—the Feast of His dying love, should ever be, among those who are called His disciples, an occasion of envyings, strifes, debates.

And yet for what they were persuaded to be the truth in this matter, our Reformers, we know, earnestly contended and resisted unto blood.

If, indeed, they had God's truth on their side, a necessity was laid upon them. And if so, not on them alone, but on us also, is necessity laid, to contend for that truth which they taught and left as an heritage to us.

And, at this time, it seems that there is an especial need to clear both the teaching of our Reformers and of the Formularies of our Church from misconceptions, which are occasioning anxiety, and perplexity, and much danger to the minds of many.

It is with this object that these Papers are sent forth.

The writer professes to start with a very strong conviction, that what is called "The Doctrine of the Real Objective

Presence," was *not* the teaching of our Reformers, and is *not* the doctrine of our Church.

Not only so; he believes the grounds on which his convictions rest are so clear and firm, that he cannot but desire to ask those whose views may have been tending in an opposite direction to pause and reconsider this subject. Nay, more: he feels constrained even to beg of those, (and he hopes he may do so without offence,) who have already given in their verdict against his judgment, to go with him over the ground afresh, and carefully observe the position and bearings of the landmarks which our Reformers have set up, and left for us to maintain and defend.

At the same time, he enters on this work not without a feeling in unison with the fears of those, who viewing especially the dangers on the other side, are very anxious to shun the error which would reduce the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to mere signs. And he desires to disclaim sympathy with any views which would despoil these "holy mysteries" of any portion of their great "dignity," robbing "the bread which we break" of its effectual power, through the Communion of the Body of Christ, inwardly to strengthen man's heart, and emptying "the cup of blessing" of its exceeding blessedness, as the Communion of the Blood of Christ, to the souls of His faithful people.

And towards those whom he is, of necessity, opposing in this view of our Church's teaching, he desires, not only very earnestly to disclaim any personal feeling, but also very carefully to avoid any language which may be calculated to provoke bitterness, or wrath, or anger; being assured that the cause of truth needs not the support of human passions, and being anxious to avoid all such weapons as are not

weapons of Christian warfare, desiring indeed, if by God's mercy it may be so, so to write as to attract rather than to repel.

Further, he would desire not only himself to pray, but most earnestly to beg the prayers of others, that the God of all mercy may pardon all errors and imperfections in this work ; that the God of all peace may take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatever else may hinder from godly union and concord ; and that the Lord of all power and might may bless what there is here of His truth, to the profit of souls, and to the glory of His holy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION vii

No. I.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY . . 1

No. II.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMERS OF THE REIGNS OF HENRY VIII. AND EDWARD VI. 23

No. III.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMING DIVINES OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH 64

No. IV.

BOOKS OF SANCTION 107

No. V.

THE HOMILIES 142

No. VI.

THE CATECHISM 186

APPENDIX.

NOTE A 237
NOTE B 240
NOTE C 244
NOTE D 250
NOTE E 253
NOTE F 257
NOTE G 265
NOTE H 267
NOTE I 271
NOTE K 275
NOTE L 278

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND BOOKS QUOTED AND REFERRED TO . . 553

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 579

PAPERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. I.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

THE particular point of Eucharistic doctrine with which these Papers have immediately to do, is that which of late years has been so prominently set forth under the name of "the Real Objective Presence." At the time of the Reformation the phrase "Real Presence" was commonly regarded as indicating a doctrine *not* held by our Reformers. But while in the sense which it commonly bore they rejected it, there was another sense (as descriptive of the true efficacious Presence, not in the elements, but in the ministration) in which they were not afraid to accept and use it. And subsequently it commended itself to the judgment of some of our eminent divines, whose views were not repugnant to the principles of the Reformation.

And it is quite possible that, in the same way, the expression "Real Objective Presence" may commend itself to the minds of some, who, while willing to adopt a novel phraseology, are far from intending to adopt any novelty in doctrine.

Objection, indeed, may be taken to the form of expression. But it is not the expression, but the doctrine; not the name, but the thing, with which we are concerned. This doctrine has been taught, and is being taught, not as any matter of opinion, but as "*de fide*." It has been taught, and it is being taught, as the doctrine of the English Church.

And the enquiry is one which English churchmen are beginning to feel to be of momentous importance, and one, too, to which they should seek an answer,—whether this doctrine was, indeed, held by our Reformers; and whether it is contained in the teaching of our Formularies.

In this enquiry they are asking for guidance and help; and such guidance and help it is the primary aim of these Papers to afford.

It will be convenient, for reasons which will appear as we proceed, to bring under review: *first*, the teaching of our Reformers; *next*, that of books of lower authority in the English Church; *then*, that of (1) our Catechism and Liturgy, (2) our Articles.

In the first place we must endeavour to gain as clear a view as we can of what is meant by "The Real Objective Presence," and what *is* that doctrine, which under this name is taught by its maintainers. We must ask of them an answer to the question—

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE?

I. We are told "that in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ are present, yet not after the manner of a body, but spiritually, sacramentally, divinely, mystically, ineffably, supra-locally, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost."[1]

II. But with this we are told,[2] that the body and blood of Christ are REALLY, TRULY, and SUBSTANTIALLY so present, after consecration, *in, or under the form of bread and wine, that* (unless[3] by special Divine interference this Presence be with-

[1] See Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 204. "So in regard to the Holy Eucharist, I believe Him to be locally present only in Heaven, when He is localised by His Ascension in the flesh; but supra-locally (as has been said by most thoughtful theologians) He is present both in His Godhead and in His Manhood." (Machonochie's Address, Jan., 1867, p. 5.)

[2] See "Tracts for the Day," No. v., p. 18, and p. 30. "Under those external Forms there is the *true, real*, and *substantial* Presence of Christ's Body and Blood."

[3] Which Dr. Pusey seems to think an admissible opinion in the case of the consecrated element being devoured by an animal, or by wicked men. (See Pusey, "Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 37.) Elsewhere Dr. Pusey says, "Certainly, it does follow from the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence that, *unless Almighty God interfere*, the wicked would receive sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ, although they cannot receive Christ in their souls, or be 'partakers of Christ.' But this was the very point on which I did not venture to decide." (Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 257.) Now Dr. Pusey believes as *certain truth*, that the wicked *do* receive Christ's body and blood. (Ibid. p. 307.) Archdeacon Denison says, "We do not know that the Presence thus vouchsafed is, under any circumstances, *withdrawn*." See "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 13; see also p. 49. Pope Innocent is quoted as teaching that in case of a mouse eating the host, "miraculously doth the substance of bread return again; not that bread which was turned into flesh; but it cometh to pass, that instead of it, other bread is miraculously created, which bread is eaten." (Bullinger's Decades, v., 306.) But

drawn) *where the elements are, there, of necessity* [1] *are the body and blood of Christ, and this quite independent and irrespective of use and participation*,[2] so that—

(1) When the bread is taken into the hand, from the hand of the priest, there in the bodily hand is the Body of Christ; and when the mouth receives the bread and wine, there in the bodily mouth, under the form of bread and wine, is the Body and Blood of Christ.[3]

(2) Wicked men and unbelievers, receiving the bread and wine, receive, equally with believers, the very Body and Blood of Christ.[4]

(3) When the elements are on the Holy Table, there is Christ under the form of bread and wine, and Christ being there, is there to be adored,[5] under those forms of bread and wine.

another Pope (Gregory XI., an. 1371) prohibited this teaching under pain of excommunication. (See Stillingfleet in Gibson's "Preservative," ix., p. 232; also Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 73; Ridley's Works, p. 199.)

[1] "Ex necessitate rei." (Denison as quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., 13.)

[2] "It does not depend in any manner on our faith. By consecration Christ is present, whether we believe it or whether we believe it not. His presence is not dependent upon our use of the Sacrament. He is present before its use, in its use, and after its use." ("Tracts for the Day," No. v., p. 26.)

"This Presence I believe to be conferred by the Word of Christ as spoken by the priest, through the operation of God the Holy Ghost, irrespective of faith or any personal qualifications either in the consecrator or receiver." (Machonochie's Address, Jan., 1867, p. 6.)

[3] See Archdeacon Denison as quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., 16; also Dr. Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," Preface, xxv. etc. "The same sacrament, the whole sacrament, robbed of no part of itself, is in the mouth of all, *good and bad*." (Denison's "Saravia," p. 105. See also pp. 208-31, 33, etc.) "I believe . . . that the Body and Blood of Christ are objectively given by the priest, objectively taken by every communicant." (Machonochie's Address, Jan., 1867, p. 5. See also "Tracts for the Day," No. v., pp. 26, 27; and Forbes on Articles, ii., p. 589.)

[4] "All, worthy and unworthy, receive the *Sacramentum*, the outward part; they all alike receive the *Res Sacramenti*, the inward part: but only the worthy receive the *Virtus* Sacramenti." ("Tracts for the Day," iii., 79.) "The consequence of either kind of unworthiness is not that we receive the sign without the thing signified, the Sacrament without the substance, but that we receive both, in the one case to condemnation, and in the other without the benefits." (Ibid. v. 24.) "The Church also teaches that this Presence depends on God's will, not on man's belief; and therefore that bad and good people receive the very same thing in communicating; the good for their benefit, the bad for their condemnation." (Rev. A. T. Littledale, LL.D., "The Real Presence.")

[5] "The question then, as to the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. . . . The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress which He wore as Man." (Pusey, "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 329, 330. See also Denison in "Goode on Eucharist," p. 15.) "The Christian Church teaches and has always taught that in the Holy Communion, after consecration, the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are verily and

(4) By virtue of this Presence, the Holy Eucharist is the sacrifice of the New Covenant,[1] quite distinct from any figurative or only commemorative offering, or any offering of (1) prayer and praise, or (2) of ourselves, our souls and bodies, or (3) of our alms and oblations; inasmuch as that same body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest.[2]

The doctrine of this sacrifice is regarded by some as easily reconcileable with the Sacrifice of the Mass.[3]

It is important to add that by some of the teachers of this doctrine very *special* stress is laid on the Body and Blood of Christ being "given in and by the consecrated bread and wine to *all*" (whether worthy or unworthy) and "received by *all* who come to the Lord's Table." And the importance of this, we are told, is, that "it supplies an unfailing test of what is meant by any one who affirms of himself that he holds the doctrine of the Real Presence."[4]

indeed present on the altar, under the forms of bread and wine." (Rev. A. T. Littledale, LL.D., "The Real Presence.")

[1] See Rev. A. D. Wagner's evidence before Ritual Commission, p. 113. "Thoughts on Low Masses," p. 31, and Stuart's "Mediation of the Church," p. 46.

[2] See "Profession of Faith" signed by twenty-one clergymen in first report of Royal Commission on Ritual. "The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence." (Pusey's "Eirenicon," p. 25.)

"Without that doctrine as containing and inferring the Sacerdotal office of the priest, and the sacrificial character of the altar, there would seem to me to be no Church at all." (Bennett's "Plea for Toleration," p. 2.) "I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice." (Rev. W. J. Bennett before Ritual Commission, p. 72.)

"It is no bare sign of an absent victim that we offer before God in the Holy Eucharist . . . but by the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament veiled beneath the form of bread and wine, we offer before God, Christ Himself." (Stuart's "Mediation of the Church," p. 46.)

"The Eucharistic Sacrifice, is Christ Himself, supernaturally present in the Sacrament, the victim slain once for all upon the Cross." ("Thoughts on Low Masses," p. 35.) "If Christ were not substantially present in the Sacrament, then He could not be thus offered, and there would be no *real* sacrifice in the Eucharist whatever." (Ibid. p. 44.) "The presence of the one Spotless Victim upon our altars must plead for us here, must be an effectual propitiation, the presentation of a true and proper sacrifice." (Tract, "Thou art a Priest for ever," p. 17.) "That offering the Church makes on her thousand altars, the Spotless Lamb of God, present under the outward forms of bread and wine." (Ibid. p. 15.)

[3] See Pusey's "Eirenicon," p. 28.

[4] See Denison as quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 18. "A High Churchman believes that when the priest utters the words of institution 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' the Holy Ghost comes down upon the elements of Bread and Wine, and they become the Very Real Body and Blood of Christ. This, they believe, is received by good and bad communicants alike." (Husband's "Catholic Tracts," i., p. 5.)

It is to be carefully observed also that this Presence is to be regarded, according to its teachers, as something quite distinct and different from any Presence of the virtue, efficacy, and saving power of Christ's Body and Blood. It is nothing less than the Body and Blood of Christ themselves, which (according to "the Real Objective Presence") are "PRESENT THINGS" "under the form of Bread and Wine."[1]

Such being the doctrine taught under the name of "the Real Objective Presence,"[2] we proceed first—

TO COMPARE THIS DOCTRINE WITH THE TEACHING OF OUR REFORMERS.

We turn to the writings of our Reformers to enquire,

I. Did they teach this doctrine?

Or, II. Did they regard it as an open question?

Or, III. Did they not reject and repudiate it?

At the threshold of this enquiry it may be well to observe that the phrase "Real Presence" was in common use at the time of the Reformation, to signify one chief part[3] of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that part which the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist (commonly known as Consubstantiation[4]) did not reject, and which, it seems to be generally[5]

[1] See Denison as quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., 14. "He is present *substantially*, not by any grace or virtue emanating from His Sacred Body, or infused into the Bread and Wine; but in the very substance of His true Body and Blood. It is not a presence of 'power or virtue,' but of PERSON. The Bread and Wine are not called His Body and Blood because they are virtually, or to all intents and purposes, such to us who receive them. Neither are they figures and symbols of a person absent, having no influence upon us except to teach or to awaken thought. Under these external forms there is the *true, real,* and *substantial* presence of CHRIST'S Body and Blood, animated by the living soul, and both pervaded by the Living Deity—whole CHRIST, GOD, and MAN." ("Tracts for the Day," v., 30.)

[2] I trust in the above statement there is nothing which may tend to misrepresent or distort the views of the Ritualists. It is not meant that all who stand on the side of the Real Objective Presence would accept the *whole* of the doctrine as here set down. It may be hoped that many would subscribe to but a small part of it. And many more there may be, who have something of a favourable leaning towards the doctrine, from a misapprehension, that any other view leaves faith without an Object,—to create, by emotion or imagination, a Presence which is not real, and to receive that which is neither offered nor given. There is reason to think that such a misconception is very prevalent. Something like it seems to underlie a considerable portion of "The Kiss of Peace," and to pervade many of the writings on the same side.

[3] See "Goode on Eucharist," i., 3, Garbett's Lectures, "Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," p. 13, sq.

[4] Note that the name "Consubstantiation" was accepted by the Lutherans themselves. It might, no doubt, be understood as implying a teaching which they never taught.

[5] Not however by Archdeacon Denison. See his words in "Goode on Eucharist," i., 19. Dr. Pusey seems to accept Luther's dottrine on the Eucharist, so far at

now understood and admitted, is at one with the doctrine known as "the Real Objective Presence."

And when this doctrine is sometimes spoken of by Romish writers as the "Corporal Presence," or the "Carnal Presence," we are not to suppose that by this they meant "Presence *after a bodily manner*" (any more than those who now teach "the Real Objective Presence") but "Presence *of a Body*," though it be of a Body present after the manner of a spirit.[1]

In conducting our enquiry as to the opinion of our Reformers[2] on this question, we will first take in order the Archbishops of Canterbury, beginning with the reign of Edward VI., and ending with the reign of Elizabeth.

We shall thus have before us four names: 1. Cranmer. 2. Parker. 3. Grindal. 4. Whitgift.

least as the Real Presence is concerned; but objecting, "The weak point in the Lutheran system is, that the only office assigned to the Sacrament is to kindle faith." ("Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers," p. 37.) So again, "The strength of the strict Lutheranism was its adherence to the meaning of our Lord's words, as the Church has ever received them, its weakness was to make our Lord's gift of His own Body and Blood, a *mere* testimony to faith." ("Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 109.) Transubstantiation only seems to add to this the absence of the substance of Bread and Wine. See Sarpi's "Council of Trent," p. 309; and Dr. Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 151-157. Dr. Pusey says, "My own conviction is, that our Articles deny Transubstantiation in one sense, and that the Roman Church according to the explanation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, affirms it in another. . . . A very eminent foreign Divine, of the Roman Communion, allows (I am informed) that 'the *materia* of bread and wine remains,' and that, following Theodoret, Pope Gelasius, and other Fathers, we may say that 'there are two natures in the Sacrament.' But, if so, the whole controversy between us is at an end." ("Eirenicon," pp. 229, 230.) The Romish opponents of the Reformers claimed the Lutherans as holding with them on the doctrine of the Real Presence. And Lutheran statements of doctrine have been accepted by Romish theologians so far as regards the Real Presence. Mr. Cobb (Sequel, pp. 179, 180) says of the quotation of Gardiner from the Lutheran Oepinus ("Cranmer on Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., p. 20), "Now here is an explanation of the Holy Eucharist, which is not only true, but which if addressed to the mind of a person conversant with scholastic definition and the real teaching of Rome, would instantly commend itself as a just and exact statement of Roman belief on the subject."

[1] See "Goode on Eucharist," i., 15, 19. Bellarmine says that "Christ's Body is there truly, substantially, really, but not corporally, nay you may say spiritually." "But 'spiritually' with him means, after the manner of spirits." See Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence," pp. 16, 17. So Gardiner, "Speaking in the Catholic teaching of the manner of Christ's presence, they call it a spiritual manner of presence," in Cranmer, P. S. Edit., i., 112. See also pp. 89, 91, 111, 155, 175, 189, and Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation," chap. iii., 1; and Dr. Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 211.

[2] This word is here used to include not only those to whom the term might be more strictly applied, but also divines of the Reformed Church up to the death of Queen Elizabeth.

1. Cranmer.

Cranmer was born in 1489; educated at Jesus College, Cambridge; married a niece of Osiander, 1531; was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, 1533. His influence was predominant in the Reformation of Edward VI. He was imprisoned on the accession of Mary in 1553, then taken to Oxford, and after disputation, condemned and excommunicated as a heretic. His courage failed him, and he was prevailed upon to sign a recantation. But, at last, he died in the faith of the Reformation, most solemnly recanting his recantation, and declaring, "I believe concerning the Sacrament as I taught in my book against the late Bishop of Winchester." He was burnt on the 21st March, 1555, his left hand pointing upwards, his right hand (which had signed the recantation) thrust into the flames with the cry, "Oh! this unworthy hand!" "With upturned eye the poor penitent exclaimed, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit.' The body was motionless; not once did it swerve from its position; it seemed to be as insensible of pain as the stake to which it was bound." (Hook's Lives. Series 2, vol. ii., p. 417.)

No doubt there are in the writings of Cranmer (as of others among our Reformers) expressions used sometimes, such as, isolated from the context, and viewed apart from explanatory statements, might seem to be not inconsistent with the doctrine before us. All such passages are cleared from misunderstanding, and have their true sense stamped upon them, by the following very clear and distinct statement in his Preface to "The Answer to Gardiner." (Edition of 1551.)

I.

"When I say and repeat many times in my book, that the Body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and of His Blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments." (Parker Society Edition, p. 3.)

A few more extracts from Cranmer's writings shall be set down here.

II.

"They (the Papists) say that Christ is corporally under or in the form of bread and wine. We say that Christ is NOT THERE, neither *corporally* nor *spiritually;* but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, He is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." (P. S. Edit., i., p. 54.)

III.

"This spiritual meat of Christ's Body and Blood is *not received in the mouth* and digested in the stomach (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be,) but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere *faith.* And the *true eating and drinking* of the said Body and Blood of Christ is, with a constant and lively *faith to believe*, that Christ gave His body, and shed His blood upon the Cross for us, and that He doth so join and incorporate Himself to us, that He is our head and we His members, and flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones, having Him dwelling in us, and we in Him." (Ibid. p. 43.)

IV.

"I mean not that Christ is *spiritually* either *in the table*, or *in the bread and wine* that be upon the table; but I mean that He is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy Supper, according to His own institution and ordinance." (Ibid. p. 148.)

V.

"I am *sure* that evil men DO NOT eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 426.)

VI.

"Christ spake absolutely of manna and of the Supper; so that, after that absolute speaking of the Supper, wicked men *can* IN NO WISE *eat of the flesh of Christ and drink His blood.*"[1] (Ibid. p. 427.)

VII.

"This therefore shall be my issue: that as no Scripture, so no ancient author, known and approved, hath in plain terms your transubstantiation: nor that the Body and Blood of Christ

[1] The italics and capitals in these quotations *generally* are mine.

be *really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine;* NOR THAT EVIL MEN DO EAT THE VERY BODY AND DRINK THE VERY BLOOD OF CHRIST; nor *that Christ is offered every* day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sin." (Ibid. p. 13.)

VIII.

In Cranmer's disputations at Oxford, we have Weston concluding an argument thus:—"*Ergo*, His true, natural, organical flesh is given to us to be eaten." Then follows—

Cranmer:—"I grant the consequence and the consequent."

Weston:—"Therefore we eat it with our mouth."

Cranmer:—"I DENY IT. We eat it through faith." (Ibid. p. 403.)

IX.

Again, *Weston*:—"When Christ said, 'Eat ye,' whether meant He, by the mouth or by faith?"

Cranmer:—"He meant that we should receive the body by faith, the bread by the mouth."

Weston:—"Nay, the body by the mouth."

Cranmer:—"THAT I DENY." (Ibid. p. 404).

X.

The following passage is given to show that Cranmer was contending against no gross, carnal, popular conception of the "Real Presence," as distinguished from the more recondite teaching of theologians.

"But why should I join with you here an issue in that matter which I never spake? For I never read, nor heard no man that said, saving you alone, that we do eat Christ grossly, or carnally, or as eating is taken in common speech without any figure; but all that ever I have heard or read say quite clean contrary."[1] (Ibid. p. 112.)

[1] This passage is quoted by Dr. Blakeney in a paper in "The Protestant Churchman" (July, 1869, p. 319). Dr. Blakeney adds, "Cranmer is astonished that Gardiner would acknowledge a carnal Presence even in a sense, and says that in doing so he stood alone. What a refutation is this of the assumption of Dr. Newman, of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Perry, and others, that it was only against a gross and carnal Presence the Reformers contended!" It is, indeed, obvious to every one reading the writings and disputations of the Reformers, that they had to deal with, not any gross popular statements of doctrines, but just the same subtilties as we have to meet now. But our Reformers held that the Corporal Presence, being the presence of a body, must, of necessity, be a gross and carnal Presence.

It would be easy to multiply quotations from Cranmer; but the above are perhaps more than sufficient to show clearly what

And herein Mr. Cobb, in the sequel to the "Kiss of Peace" (Preface, vii., and Sec. ii. *passim*) when he complains that Cranmer "never understood what was the Roman doctrine on this question," is himself, if I mistake not, altogether misunderstanding Cranmer. Cranmer must have been very blind indeed, if he did not see where Gardiner would have led him. Cranmer *saw clearly enough*, but he altogether *refused to follow*. He denied that it was possible to follow without *absurdities*. I think Mr. Cobb will find that Cranmer did "*consciously reject*" what Mr. Cobb calls "the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence." (See Sequel, p. 211.) For not only did his mind *never grasp* the idea that there could be such a Presence real, yet not "corporal;" but his mind actually denied it. Nay, I believe Mr. Cobb will find that not Cranmer only, but our Reformers, and not our Reformers only, but subsequent Divines, maintained that the Presence of a Body, not as a Body, involves a contradiction. "Truth in what kind soever, is by no kind of truth gainsayed." (Hooker, Vol. ii., p. 360, Edit. Keble.) And, therefore, they held that the *truth* of Christ's Body, being corporally and locally present in heaven, forbids its being present, even though it be the Body of Christ, in another manner, that is to say, spiritually and *supralocally* on ten thousand altars at once. (See especially "Cranmer on Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., pp. 97, 98, 102, 140, 186.) And I must venture to submit that it was no peculiarity in the minds of Cranmer and our Reformers, that they *could not grasp* the idea of the Corporal Presence of a Body which has flesh and bones, being present *with flesh and bones;* yet present not corporally, but spiritually as to the mode, *i.e.*, present after *the manner of a spirit*, which "*hath not flesh and bones.*"

The Corporal Presence of a Body corporally present with flesh and bones, THIS IS *a gross Carnal Presence.* And its grossness and carnality is *not* to be evaded or escaped by attempting to explain that the word "corporally" does not tell of the *manner* of the Presence, which is spiritual. If the explanation is *good*, the teaching which it explains is *gone*. If the teaching is *good*, the explanation is *worthless*. Is it wonderful that such evasions found "*no response*" in Cranmer's mind? (Page 187.)

Suppose I maintain the presence of an angle as an *obtuse* angle; but finding an *obtuse* angle inadmissible, I attempt by explanation to make it appear that though a very obtuse angle, it is only very *acutely* present, or present after the manner of a very *acute* angle.

Will any one grasp my idea? Will not every one accuse me of absurdities? Shall I not be told that what is "acute" in the explanation of the *manner*, can never take away from what is "obtuse" in the statement concerning the angle?

And will the case be very different if I venture to say that in the matter before us, that which is "spiritual" in the explanation of the mode, can never take away from that which is "corporal" in the statement concerning the Presence? How difficult it is to reconcile the statement of the "corporal," and the explanation of the "spiritual" in the minds of the uneducated is evident, I suppose, from what we are told of "the gross popular view" which our Reformers had to combat. (See "Cranmer on Lord's Supper," p. 327.) How difficult also in the case of minds, some of which, at least, we should have expected to be better instructed, is evident from the words which Mr. Cobb quotes of King Henry the Fourth:—

"The clergy," he said, "should engage in the search for the philosopher's stone; for since they can change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, they must also, by the help of God, succeed in transmuting the baser metals into gold" (Sequel, p. 169); and still more from the well-known recantation put into the mouth of Berengarius by Pope Nicholas, viz.:—

"That the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ sensually, not only in sacrament, but in truth, is handled by the priest's hands; and broken and grinded by the teeth of the faithful," words which though now renounced by the Church of Rome, were publicly read at Rome before one hundred and fourteen

Cranmer's views were. The place which Cranmer occupies in the history of the English Reformation will justify our taking *so many*. To give more is the less needful now, because Dr. Pusey has acknowledged that Cranmer went "over to the Swiss school,"[1] and "unhappily fell" into the "Zwinglian heresy;" and the author of "The Kiss of Peace" has been constrained in his new edition altogether to give him up.[2] One only quotation shall now be added to show that Cranmer not only had himself views clearly and distinctly opposed to the doctrine in question, but also was so far from looking upon the matter as a question to be left open, that he regarded the doctrine as one to be utterly repudiated by the Reformed Church.

XI.

"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, (as they call it,) and of the *sacrifice* and *oblation* of Christ made

bishops, and sent by the Pope up and down the Churches of Italy, France, and Germany. (See "Jeremy Taylor," vol. vi., p. 203, etc.)

But the question is, Are the two really reconcileable in truth? No doubt it will be said, "Certainly they are, to faith which believes miracles." (See "Tracts for the Day," No. v., pp. 31, 32.)

But to this let it be answered, "A miracle is one thing: a contradiction is another." And one not versed in the subtilties of the schools may, I trust, be forgiven in expressing a strong opinion, that, as it is a very unwise proceeding to aim at anything like training faith to believe all sorts of miracles without warrant of Scripture, or any other sufficient evidence; so it is a most dangerous thing to set faith to exercise itself in doing anything like putting out the eyes of common sense.

Hooker says of Christ's glorious Body: "A Body still it continueth, a Body consubstantial with our bodies, a Body of the same both nature and measure which it had on earth." ("Eccles. Pol." v., 55.)

Jeremy Taylor writes: "God can new create the body, and change it into a spirit; but can a body, remaining a body, be at the same time a spirit? Or can it be a body, and yet not be in a place? Is it not determined so, that remaining in a place, it cannot be out of it? . . . Now although God can change anything from being the thing it is to become another thing, yet is it not a contradiction to say it should be the same it is, and yet not the same? These are the essential, immediate consequents of supposing a body remaining a body, whose essence it is to be finite and determined in one place, can yet so remaining, be in a thousand places." ("Real Presence," sect. xi., p. 14; vol. vi., p. 107.)

[1] See "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 11 and 159.

[2] "I am convinced that Cranmer at any rate did not maintain an Objective Presence of any kind." (Preface to Sequel, p. 7.)

by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. WHICH ROOTS, IF THEY BE SUFFERED TO GROW IN THE LORD'S VINEYARD, THEY WILL OVERSPREAD ALL THE GROUND AGAIN WITH THE OLD ERRORS AND SUPERSTITIONS. These injuries to Christ be *so intolerable*, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them. Wherefore, seeing that many have set to their hand, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand, and are with the rest, to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots, which our Heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in His vineyard by His adversary the devil, and Antichrist his minister." (Preface to Edit. 1550, P. S., p. 6.)

2. PARKER.

Matthew Parker was born A.D. 1504; entered at Cambridge, 1520. In 1534 he was made Chaplain to Queen Anne Boleyn, by whom, six days before her apprehension, he was charged with the care of her daughter Elizabeth. (Correspondence, P. S. Edit., pp. 59, 391, 400.) Hence, no doubt, his appointment on Elizabeth's accession to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, which very unwillingly (Ibid. p. 57) he was constrained to accept. Hence also his influence with Elizabeth, which he used for the removal, at the commencement of her reign, of the Crucifix and Lights from her chapel. (Ibid. pp. 97, 379; *Zur.* Letters, i., pp. 122, 129.) In conjunction with others, he also successfully remonstrated against Images. (Ibid. pp. 79-96.) The "Bishop's Bible" was prepared under his direction. In his archbishopric the Reformed Prayer-book was revised, and the 39 Articles reduced to their present form. He was confessed a learned man, but his strictness in enforcing Conformity gave him an evil name with the Puritans. He died 1575.

Archbishop Parker has left us no publication bearing directly on the subject of these Papers. His doctrinal views will come under consideration in a future paper. For the present it may suffice to observe, (1) That we owe to Parker the 29th of our present Articles,[1] the title of which is "OF THE WICKED WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER;" and, (2) that the book of Whitgift, from which the extracts below are taken, was written by Parker's appointment,

[1] See "Soames's Elizabethan History," pp. 157, 211. "Hardwick on Articles," p. 128.

and was submitted[1] to him for approval and correction,[2] so that on important doctrinal matters, at least, they must be regarded as substantially expressing the opinions of Archbishop Parker.

3. Grindal.

Edmund Grindal was born 1519; educated at Cambridge, where he greatly distinguished himself. In 1550 Bishop Ridley appointed him one of his chaplains, together with Bradford and Rogers. In 1551 he was appointed Chaplain to King Edward. On the death of Edward he took refuge on the Continent. Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he was made Bishop of London in 1559 and in 1570 Archbishop of York, whence, on the death of Parker, in 1575, he was removed to Canterbury. He died in 1583.

The following are quotations from Grindal's writings:—

I.

"I will return to my former question, and prove more at large that Christ's body CANNOT BE EATEN OF THE WICKED. . . . Moreover, Christ's body must be received WITH FAITH, and NOT WITH THE MOUTH, . . . but wicked and impenitent persons lack faith, wherefore they CANNOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 58.)

II.

"Thus, by the Word of God, by reason, and by the old fathers, it is plain that sinful men EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST, receive they the Sacrament never so oft." (Ibid. p. 59.)

III.

"Christ's body is food, not for the body, but for the soul; and therefore it must *be received with the instrument of the soul, which is faith.* For as ye receive sustenance for your body by your bodily mouth, so the food of your soul must be received by faith, which is the mouth of the soul." (Ibid. p. 44).

[1] See "Neal's History of Puritans," i., p. 193. "Soames's Elizabethan History," pp. 174-5.

[2] "I have sent unto your Grace the first part of my book, which I beseech your Grace to peruse, and to *correct*, *alter*, *add*, or *take away* what you shall think convenient. . . . My Lord of Lincoln hath perused the book, and so hath Dr. Perne, and they both like of it. . . . If it will please your Grace to have me dedicate it to any, either the Queen's Majesty, the Parliament, or any other, I will stay until I hear from you." (Whitgift's Letter to Parker in P. S. Edit. of Whitgift, iii., 600.)

IV.

"And whereas you say that the Spirit hath no mouth, like as it hath no body or bones, you are deceived; for the *Spirit hath a mouth in its kind*. . . . Whereof I will reason thus: Of whatsoever sort the mouth is, such is his food. But the mouth of the Spirit is spiritual, not bodily. Therefore it receiveth Christ's body spiritually, not bodily. And in like manner Christ, speaking of the eating of His body, nameth Himself the bread, not for the body, but of life, for the soul; and saith, 'He that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.' Wherefore whoso will be relieved by the body of Christ, must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto, not with his teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ's body must be received and taken with faith, I mean not that you should pluck down Christ from heaven and put Him in your faith, as in a visible place, but that you must with your faith rise and spring up to Him, and, leaving this world, dwell above in heaven, putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in Him, which suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty and to make you free; creeping into His wounds, which were so cruelly pierced and dented for your sake. *So shall you feed on the body of Christ;* so shall you suck the blood that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, THE VERY TRUE, the ONLY EATING of Christ's body. . . . It is plain that Christ's body is meat for our spirit, and hath NOTHING TO DO WITH OUR BODY." (Ibid. pp. 45, 46.)

V.

"Mark well what ye have said, for you have granted me great repugnance. First, you say, that no body, being not spiritual, can be in sundry places at once. Then say you, that at the Maundy Christ's body was not spiritual; and yet hold you, that He was there present, visible before the apostle's eyes, and in each of their hands and mouths all at one time, which grants of yours are not agreeable." (Ibid. p. 51.)

VI.

"Christ in a sacrament gave His own body to be eaten in faith. The priest, for lack of faith, receiveth accidents and dimensions. Christ gave a *sacrament* to strengthen men's faith; the priest giveth a *sacrifice* to redeem men's souls.

Christ gave it to be eaten, the priest giveth it to be worshipped. And to conclude, Christ gave bread: the priest saith he giveth a God." (Ibid. p. 57.)

VII.

"I owe then this to you as an individual, that by the perusal of your treatise on the 'Origin of Error,' about twenty years since, I was first led to entertain a correct opinion respecting the Lord's Supper; whereas before that time I had adopted the sentiments of Luther on that subject. It is but just, therefore, that I should respect him from whom I have received so much benefit." (Letter to H. Bullinger, Feb. 8th, 1567. Zurich Letters, i., 182.)

These extracts are conclusive as to Grindal's own views. We have also sufficient testimony as to the fact of his regarding this matter as no open question in the Church of England. Writing to Bullinger, August 27th, 1566, he says, "We most fully agree with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth." (Zurich Letters, i., 169.)

Still more important is a letter written by him in conjunction with Bishop Horne, in answer to a false report which had been spread abroad on the Continent, that in the English Church the bread was not broken in common, but put into the mouth, and that the mode of spiritual manducation and of the presence of Christ's body in the sacred Supper was not to be explained, but to be left open.

The false report is contained in a letter from Bullinger and Gualter, in which it was said—

"Nunc vero audimus (utinam rumore falso) requiri. . . . Neque vero modum spiritualis manducationis, et praesentiæ Corporis Christi in Sacra Cæna explicandum, sed relinquendum in medio."[1]

In answer to this letter the reply of Bishops Grindal and Horne states—

"Almost all these articles are falsely imputed to us. . . . The Church of England, too, has entirely given up the use of [prayers in] a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, *lighted tapers*, and other things of that kind, which, by the Act of Parliament are never to be restored. We entirely

[1] See "Soames's Elizabethan History," p. 68.

agree that women[1] neither can nor ought to baptise infants, upon any account whatever. In the receiving of the Lord's Supper, the laws require, custom sanctions, and our Anglo-Louvaine calumniators in their reckless writings bear us witness, that we break the bread in common to every communicant, not putting it into his mouth, but placing it in his hand. *They testify also to* OUR EXPLANATION *of the* MANNER OF THE SPIRITUAL FEEDING AND PRESENCE *of the body of Christ* in the holy Supper." (Zurich Letters, i., pp. 178, 179.)

4. WHITGIFT.

John Whitgift was born about 1530; educated at Cambridge, at Pembroke Hall, where Ridley was Master, and Grindal and Bradford were Fellows. Bradford was his tutor. He did not leave England, but escaped persecution during the reign of Queen Mary. In 1567 he was made Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth. As Master of Trinity College, he was brought into antagonism with Thomas Cartwright, (T. C.,) the Puritan. Subsequently he wrote an answer to the "Admonition to the Parliament." Cartwright replied. And Whitgift, in 1574, published the Defence of his Answer. In 1577 he was consecrated Bishop of Winchester. He refused to be removed to Canterbury during the lifetime of Grindal, who had incurred the Queen's displeasure; but accepted the archbishopric on Grindal's death in 1583. He attended Queen Elizabeth on her death-bed, and crowned King James in 1603, was present at the Hampton Court Conference, and died in 1604.

I.

He wrote in answer to T. C. (*i.e.* Thomas Cartwright):—

"I never heard that any learned man as yet misliked this place of Augustine;[2] but I know they have used it as a most manifest testimony against Transubstantiation and *the Real Presence*, and as a *true declaration* wherefore the sacramental

[1] Grindal therefore did not understand the Rubric as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's reign, as allowing Baptism by women. On this matter there might be doubt. (See Hooker, Edit. Keble, ii., p. 277, sq.) Whitgift, however, agreed with Grindal. (See his works, P. S. Edit., ii., 495, sq.; 535-6; iii., 493.) All doubt was taken away by the change in the Rubric made at the Hampton Court Conference, from "They baptise not children at-home in their houses," to "They procure not their children to be baptised at-home in their houses," with the addition, "Let the minister of the parish, (or in his absence, any other lawful minister that can be procured) with," etc. See also "Neal's History of the Puritans," vol. i., p. 397; and "Soames's Elizabethan History," p. 535.

[2] Whitgift had quoted (and T. C. had objected to the quotation) the well-known saying of Augustine, "As after a certain manner of speaking the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, is the Body of Christ: the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, is the Blood of Christ; so the Sacrament of faith is faith."

bread and wine be called the Body and Blood of Christ, being but the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ." (Works, P. S. Edit., iii., p. 113.)

II.

T. C.: "*You would think you had wrong, if because some of those that favour that which you favour in this matter be either freewill men, or hold Consubstantiation in the Sacrament, you should be challenged as freewill men, or maintainers of Consubstantiation.*"

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"If there were either so many 'freewill men, or maintainers of the Consubstantiation,' as there be of the sect of the Puritans; or *if they were maintained and justified* by us, as the other be by you, then, surely you might justly charge us with their errors; else the reason is not like." (Works, vol. i., pp. 94-5-6.)

III.

T. C.: "*But the case standeth in this, that, forasmuch as the common and usual speech of England is, to note by the word 'priest' not a minister of the Gospel, but a sacrificer, which the minister of the Gospel* IS NOT; *therefore we ought not to call the ministers of the Gospel 'priests.'*"

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"I am not greatly delighted with the name, nor so desirous to maintain it; but yet a truth is to be defended. I read in the old fathers that these two names, *sacerdos* and *presbyter*, be confounded. I see also that the learned and the best of English writers, such I mean as write in these our days, translate this word *presbyter* so; and the very word itself, as it is used in our English tongue, soundeth the word *presbyter*. As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for *a sacrificer*, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for *a minister of the Gospel*.[1] But it is mere vanity to contend for

[1] The rejection of the words "altar," "sacrifice," and "priest," in the sacerdotal sense, will be found frequently recurring in the writings of our Reformers.

In another sense, however, there were those among the Reformers, English and Foreign, (including Beza,) as well as among our subsequent Divines, who were not afraid to speak of the Eucharist, as a sacrifice as well as a sacrament. This language, in which "sacrifice" has an extended meaning, led, no doubt, to a feeling very different from that of the Reformers, not only as to the *word* "altar," but to

the name WHEN WE AGREE OF THE THING: the name may be used, and not used without any great offence." (Works, vol. iii., p. 351.)

IV.

But we have most important testimony, not only of Whitgift's repudiating the doctrine of the Real Presence for himself but of the Church of England having *refused* it.

T. C. had said:—

"*Peter Martyr, upon the x chapter of the second book of the Kings saith, that the Lutherans must take heed lest, whilst they cut off many popish errors, they follow Jehu by retaining also many popish things. For they defend still the Real Presence in the Bread of the Supper, and images, and vestments, etc.; and saith that 'religion must be wholly reformed to the quick.'*"

In reply Whitgift says:—

"Mr. Martyr nameth the popish things which the Lutherans

the thing signified by it; subsequently also, in some cases, to some real doctrinal confusion.

Hence, in respect of this matter, our English reformed theology may be said to flow in two channels—one stream keeping clear of the words "sacrifice" and "altar," using these words in their more limited sense, and denying that the Christian Church has any proper sacrifice; the other using the word sacrifice in its wider sense, and maintaining that though we have indeed no *propitiatory sacrifice*, yet there is no reason why the memorial of the *One Sacrifice*, and the offering of ourselves, and the sacrifice of praise, should not be regarded as included under *sacrifice proper*.

The language adopted by the first class has certainly the advantage of clearness. The distinction is very broad and deep between the two senses in which the other class uses the same word *sacrifice*.

The second class claims for its use of language the advantage of employing the terms in the same sense as the ancient Christian Fathers.

The doctrinal difference between the two classes must not be magnified. Waterland distinctly classes himself with the second, and alluding to Hooker's assertion, that we have now properly "no sacrifice," he says, "I presume he meant by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the *sense* of the Trent Council, or of the *new* definitions. In such a *sense* as that, he might justly say, that *sacrifice* is no part of the *church ministry*, or that the Christian Church has *no* sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such *new language*, be the meaning ever so right: the *fathers* never used it." (Works, vol. v., p. 140.) Yet none could be more distinctly opposed than Waterland to the Eucharistic Sacrifice *in that sense*, in which it stands connected with the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence."

Archbishop Longley, in his posthumous charge has said: "The Romish doctrine of a true, real, and substantial sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is called in the Council of Trent, entailed the use of the term *altar*. But this term appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer; and was, no doubt, omitted lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view. The notion, therefore, of making in the material elements a perpetual offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, is as foreign to the spirit and the letter of our service, as I hold it to be to the doctrine of the early Fathers, as well as of the leading Divines of our Church." (Page 26.)

observe to be the REAL PRESENCE, *images, all the popish apparel which they used in their Mass*, (for so doth he mean); which THIS CHURCH HAS REFUSED. What his opinion is of *this* apparel that *we retain* I have declared, Tract vii., chap. v., the 4th division; where he of purpose speaketh concerning the same. *God be thanked*, RELIGION IS WHOLLY REFORMED, *even to the quick*, IN THIS CHURCH." (Ibid. p. 550.)

These extracts from the writings of men holding (either at the time of writing or subsequently) the position of highest authority in the English Church, are here brought forward as expressing the views of individual Reformers. But it may be worth while to observe in passing (what indeed can scarcely escape observation) that they possess a certain historical value besides. In the case of Cranmer none will dispute that we have statements of a certain doctrine, and of a certain repudiation of doctrine, quite sufficient to show us what would be the aim of one to whom it was given, in the Providence of God, more than to any other, to mould our Formularies and frame our Articles. And in the case of Grindal and Whitgift we have declarations of doctrine and repudiation of doctrine, not for themselves alone, but on the part of the English Church. Their statements are statements of what was and what was not the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Their words cannot be understood as declaring anything less than that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence was excluded from the teaching of the English Church.

Add to this Parker's sanction of Whitgift's Book.[1] And if anything is needful to make it plain that such sanction extended to such statements concerning the doctrine of our Church, add the words of Parker himself: "We be in ONE UNIFORM DOCTRINE of the same."[2] (Letter to Cecil in Correspondence,

[1] See note above, pp. 12, 13. Of Whitgift's "*Defence*" of his Answer, Strype says distinctly that it "had the *careful inspection* of the *Archbishop* and other Bishops and learned men, before it passed abroad." (Strype's Parker, Book iv., chap. xxxviii., anno 1574, p. 364.)

[2] The letter relates to the form of bread used, praying Cecil to "help to pacify" the dissension which had arisen concerning this. Parker says, "How so many churches have of late varied I cannot tell; except it be the practice of the common adversary, the devil, to make variance and dissension in the sacrament of unity. For where we be in one uniform doctrine of the same, and so cut off much matter of variance which the Lutherans and Zuinglians do hatefully maintain, yet because we will have *some matter* of dissension, we will quarrel in a *small circumstance* of the same." Here is Parker's statement of our *unity of doctrine* only leaving room for dissension in the *circumstances* of administration. This doctrinal unity could

p. 379.) And then I think it will appear that the question, whether or not this doctrine is the doctrine of the English Church, is *reduced to the question of the* TRUTH OR FALSEHOOD OF

not be, in his view, the Lutheran doctrine, for if so it would have been a unity actually excluding the doctrine, which the most cursory perusal must have shown him in the book which he approved of Whitgift. Then it must have been in Parker's view a oneness of doctrine excluding the "Real Presence" of Luther, or it could not have excluded the disputes of Lutherans and Zuinglians. There is therefore in this letter a statement of Parker, equivalent to the statement of Grindal and Whitgift, concerning the doctrine of the English Church.

If it should be argued that, at any rate, Parker's words look like a condemnation of Zuinglian as well as of Lutheran views, and sound as if he regarded the *one* doctrine of the Church of England as being neither Zuinglian nor Lutheran; then I answer, *One thing* is perfectly clear, and it is the one thing *material* for my argument. I mean, that Parker's "ONE DOCTRINE" is the *one doctrine* which was held in common both by Conformists and Nonconformists (in this matter) between whom (since there was *no doctrinal dissension*) the seeds of discord were sown in a matter of no importance. About this much, I conceive, there can be no question whatever. And as little can there be that thus the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence is absolutely excluded from "the one doctrine" of the Church of England in Parker's view, and in his very distinct and emphatic statement. According to Parker's letter, the oneness of doctrine in England excludes dissension on doctrine; those who were puritanically disposed contending only about unimportant ceremonies, and finding no difference for which to contend in the matter of Eucharistic doctrine. But there could be no such thing as doctrinal agreement and oneness with the Puritans on the subject of the Lord's Supper, without the doctrine of Luther being excluded from that *oneness*. It seems, therefore, that there is actually no way of understanding this declaration of Archbishop Parker as being anything less than a distinct and positive denial that in the teaching of the Church of England there was any place or room for the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lutheran sense.

But this being so, it is, I conceive, quite possible that Parker may have meant his words to point a rebuke at Zuinglians as well as Lutherans, for the apprehension prevailed that the doctrine of Zuingle would leave in the sacraments nothing more than teaching ceremonies and empty signs; and such a view, no doubt Parker would have opposed, and opposed as *not* the doctrine of the English Church. So Hooker writes, "This was it that *some* did *exceedingly fear*, lest Zuinglius and Œcolampadius would bring to pass, that men should account of this sacrament but *only* as of a *shadow, destitute, empty and void* of Christ." (Vol. ii., p. 349, Keble Edit.) And to the same effect Calvin as translated by Coverdale. "After this Zuinglius and Œcolampadius begin to grow . . . they applied all the force of their wit to impugn the same [*i.e.*, the carnal presence]. . . . But whiles they were very much bent on this purpose, they omitted to declare, what presence of Christ in the Supper we ought to believe, and what communion of His body and blood is there received: insomuch that Luther supposed them willing to leave nought else but the bare signs, void of the spiritual substance. . . . We perceive therefore, in what thing Luther erred, and also wherein Zuinglius and Œcolampadius did err. . . . For notwithstanding that they (Zuinglius and Œcolampadius) denied not the verity, yet did they not teach it openly, as was beseeming. This do I understand, that whiles they gave themselves studiously and diligently to affirm that the bread and wine were called the body and blood of Christ, because they be the signs thereof, they thought not that they ought in the mean time to do this thing also, to add to that, they are the signs after such sort that the verity is nevertheless joined unto them. Neither did they declare that they went not about to deface the true communion which the Lord giveth us in His body and blood." (In Coverdale, "Fruitful Lessons," etc. P. S. Edit., pp. 463-465.)

THREE SUCCESSIVE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY. I do not see how we can fail to acknowledge this, unless indeed we are prepared to maintain that Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, were men altogether ignorant in this matter, and entirely mistaken as to what is and what is not the doctrine of the Church of England.[1]

Nay, more than this, such statements derive additional weight from the fact of their being not only spoken out with unquestioning, perfect, and, indeed, we may say, with surprising confidence, but also being allowed and accepted by Puritan adversaries, who would never have hesitated to deny them, if denial had been counted possible, or to question them, if, in their judgment, the matter had admitted of question.

Nay, we may go further still, and say, that in the case of Whitgift at least, so far as his testimony was public, and not public only, but prominent—and prominent as the statement of one who was put forward[2] (in a manner) to be the public champion of the Church of England—so far too, as afterwards it acquired additional prominence by his exaltation to the archiepiscopal throne; so far his distinct statement, not being called in question by Puritan opponents,[3] not being disputed

[1] I can hardly think that any will seriously support the hypothesis that the Church of England *intended* to exclude the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, and *was fully persuaded* that she had excluded it; but that God by His Providence or His Spirit ordered, that, through inadvertence, certain loopholes should be left in the walls which the Church had built; or certain stones left, such as might serve to give hand-hold to those who would yet desire to enter in by getting over the fences which the Church had built for the purpose of excluding the doctrines which they would bring in. On such an hypothesis what heresy might not be fastened on the teaching of our Church?

[2] See note above (on Parker). Neal says, "The *Bishops thought themselves* obliged to answer. Dr. John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, and Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, *was appointed* to this work, which he performed with great labour and study, and *dedicated it to the Church of England.* His method was unexceptionable; the whole text of the admonition being set down in paragraphs, and under each paragraph the doctor's answer. Before it was printed it was *revised and corrected* by *Archbishop Parker*, Dr. Cooper bishop of Lincoln, and Tern bishop of Ely; so that in this book, says Mr. Strype, may be seen all the arguments for and against the hierarchy, drawn to the best advantage. Dr. Whitgift's book was answered by Mr. Cartwright, whose performance was called a masterpiece in its kind, and had the approbation of great numbers in the University of Cambridge, as well as foreign divines. Whitgift replied again to Cartwright, and *had the thanks of the bishops and the queen* who, as a reward for his excellent and learned pains, made him Dean of Lincoln." ("History of Puritans," i., p. 193.)

[3] There is abundant evidence that no such serious doctrinal matter was regarded as being in question between the Conformists and the Puritans. The early history of the disputes has to do only with ceremonies and habits. Neal, after carefully enumerating matters between them, says, "There was *no difference* in points of *doctrine* between the Puritans and Conformists." (Vol. i., p. 159.)

Compare Grindal's letter to Zanchius [1571 or 1572 probably,] "When first her

by other English theologians, not being disallowed by succeeding Convocations, not being protested against by subsequent Parliaments, but silently accepted and acknowledged by the whole body of the English Church, must, I think, be regarded as carrying a weight such as weighed in the balances of unprejudiced truth cannot easily be overborne.

And this testimony, let it be observed, is testimony to the doctrine of our Church at a period, and in a reign, which subsequent changes and subsequent legislation seem to recognize as containing the true date[1] of the substantial settlement of our doctrinal Formularies.

The next Paper will be occupied with the writings of Reformers in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.

Highness, Elizabeth, under most happy auspices began her reign, the popish doctrine and worship being cast off, she restored all things to that standard of the administration of the Word of God, and the Sacraments and the whole of religion, which had been drawn up and established during the reign of Edward VI., of happy, but also of most lamented memory. To this all the states of the kingdom, with full consent, gave their voices in the great council of the nation, which in our vernacular language we call the Parliament. The authority of this council is so great, that the laws made therein cannot by any means be dissolved except by the sanction of the same. Whereas, then, in this form of religion of which I have spoken, drawn up by King Edward, there were many commands respecting the habits properly adapted to the ministers of the Church, and also concerning other things which some good men wish to be abolished or amended, it was forbidden by the authority of the law that any one should meddle with this matter. Yet the law itself allowed the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the bishops, to alter some things. . . . As for *doctrine*, hitherto we retain it unshaken and unadulterated in our Churches. And therefore, since *all our controversy* has flowed from *discipline*, these are the usual grounds of complaint. Ministers are required to wear commonly a long gown, a square cap, and a kind of tippet over the neck, hanging from either shoulder, and falling down almost to the heels. In public prayers and every sacred administration, besides the ordinary dress, the ecclesiastical discipline requires the minister to wear a linen garment, called by a new appellation, a surplice." (Grindal's Remains, P. S. Edit., pp. 338-9.) (See also the Letter of Grindal and Horn, Zur. Letters, i., p. 176. Also, Zur. Letters, i., pp. 134, 135, and 73, 74. See also "Soames's Elizabethan History," pp. 455-458.) Other evidences may be seen in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 739-741; and in Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," pp. 57-59, 128-130.

The following testimony is from Dr. Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, 1587. "The controversies between the common adversaries [the Papists] and us are *pro aris et focis*, for matters, and that capital matters, of the substance and life of our Christian religion; not trifles as some neutrals would bear the people in hand. . . . Whereas the controversies betwixt us and our brethren [the Puritans] are matters, or rather (as they call them) but manners and forms of the Church's regiment." (Defence, etc., quoted by "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 740, 741.)

[1] The Articles of the Church of England have never been altered since 1571. The changes in the Liturgy, made in 1604, were made by authority given to the Sovereign by virtue of the Act of Uniformity, Primo. Eliz. The Act of Uniformity, authorising the Prayer-book after the last review in 1662, speaks of the Book which it authorises, not as a Book then made, but as the Book of Elizabeth, with certain "additions and alterations."

No. II.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMERS OF THE REIGNS OF HENRY VIII. AND EDWARD VI.

In this Paper will be found extracts from those Reformers alone who did not survive the reign of Queen Mary. Others, however, eminent in King Edward's reign, will find their place in the Paper following.

In some cases the extracts may be thought to be unnecessarily long. But there are some which seemed too valuable to be omitted, though the evidence, as to the writer's views, might be sufficient without them. All, however, will be found, it is believed, to have an important bearing, more or less distinct, on the question before us.

Tyndale.

Tyndale is here put first, as being the earliest of those divines, from whose writings extracts will be made.

William Tyndale was born, probably 1484; removed from Oxford to Cambridge, perhaps for the sake of Erasmus' Lectures. About 1520 became tutor to the family of Sir John Walsh, in Gloucestershire. In consequence of his opinions he left Gloucestershire, withdrawing to London, and then to Antwerp, where he translated the New Testament. Afterwards he was assisted by Coverdale in the commencement of a translation of the Old Testament. But through the interference of the English Government he was apprehended at Antwerp, and in 1536 was brought to trial at Augsburg, and condemned to the stake. He was first strangled and then burnt. His last words were, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes."

In 1529 Sir Thomas More published a "Dialogue" defending the Romish doctrine of the Lord's Supper, "wherein he treated . . . many things touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale, by the one begun in Saxony, and by the other labored to be brought into England." To this work "an answer" was

published by Tyndale in 1531, and from this the first six following quotations are taken.

I.

"Here therefore it is to be noted diligently, that Christ *meaneth*, as every man may see, by the *eating of this bread*, none other thing than the *belief in Himself offered up* for our sins, which faith only justifieth us." (Answer to More, P. S. Edit., p. 226.)

II.

"Thus now may ye see how Christ's flesh, which He called bread, is the spiritual food and meat of our souls *when our souls* BY FAITH see God the Father not to have spared His only so dear beloved Son, but to have delivered Him to suffer that ignominious and so painful death, to restore us to life: *then have we eaten His flesh, and drunk His blood*, assured firmly of the favour of God, satisfied and certified of our salvation." (Ibid. p. 227.)

III.

"But now confer this saying to His purpose at the beginning, where He bade them work for that meat that should never perish, telling them that to believe in Him whom God hath sent was the work of God; and whoso believeth in Him, should never thirst nor hunger, but have life everlasting. Confer also this that followeth, and thou shalt see it plain, that His words be understood spiritually of *the belief in His flesh crucified, and His blood shed;* for which belief we be promised everlasting life, Himself saying, 'Whoso believeth in me hath life everlasting.' Here, therefore, their question, 'How may this man give us His flesh to eat it?' is solved; even when He gave His body to be broken, and His blood to be shed. And *we eat and drink it indeed, when we believe stedfastly that He died for the remission of our sins:* Austin and Tertullian to witness." (Ibid. p. 228.)

IV.

"And now, Christian reader, to put thee clean out of doubt that Christ's BODY is NOT *here* PRESENT *under the form of bread*, (as the Papists have mocked us many a day,) but in heaven, even as He rose and ascended; thou shalt know that He told His disciples, almost twenty times between the thirteenth and

eighteenth chapters of John, that He should and would go hence and leave this world." (Ibid. pp. 251, 252.)

V.

"And thus we there have Christ *present*, in the inward eye and *sight of our* FAITH. We *eat His body and drink His blood;* that is, we *believe* surely that *His body was crucified for our sins, and His blood shed for our salvation.*" (Ibid. p. 236.)

VI.

"For if our Papists take eating and drinking here bodily, as to *eat the natural body of Christ under the form of bread, and to drink His blood under the form of wine;* then must all young children (that never came to God's board) departed, and all laymen that never drank His blood, be damned." (Ibid. pp. 237, 238.)

VII.

"Wherefore, seeing that all the doctors with one accord call the sacrament so earnestly *a sacrifice*, they cannot otherwise understand than that they so say after the use of the Scripture only, because it is the *memorial of the sacrifice of His death and blood shedding.* Why should they then of right be offended, if we understand the doctors after the same manner, when they call it His body and blood; and that they so call it after the use of the Scripture, because that it is *only a memorial* of His body and blood?" (Doctrinal Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 372.)

VIII.

"There is a word called in Latin *sacerdos*, in Greek *hiereus*, in Hebrew *Cohan*, that is, a minister, an officer, a sacrificer or a priest; as Aaron was a priest, and sacrificed for the people, and was a mediator between God and them. And in the English it should have had some other name than priest. . . . Another word is there in Greek, called *Presbyter*, in Latin *senior*, in English an *elder*, and is nothing but an officer to teach, and not to be a mediator between God and us. This needeth no anointing of man. They of the Old Testament were anointed with oil, to signify the anointing of Christ, and of us through Christ with the Holy Ghost. . . . By a priest then, in the New Testament, understand nothing but an *elder* to teach the younger, and to bring them unto the full knowledge

and understanding of Christ, and to minister the sacraments which Christ ordained, which is also nothing but to preach Christ's promises." (Ibid. pp. 255, 256, 257.)

Ridley.

Nicholas Ridley was born 1500, and educated at Cambridge. During an absence of three years from England he made acquaintance with several of the Early Reformers. He became Chaplain to Cranmer in 1537. He was made Bishop of Rochester in 1547, and removed in 1550 to London, where he exerted his influence for the removal of altars. He was committed to the Tower in July, 1553, and burnt at Oxford, Oct. 16, 1555. The charge against him was that he had affirmed, and openly defended and maintained (1) that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar. (2) That in the sacrament of the altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine. (3) That in the Mass is no propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. (See Works, P. S. Edit., p. 271.)

Ridley's views have a claim on our careful attention peculiarly their own. For Ridley may be called the master-mind of the English Reformation in the reign of Edward VI. The Romanists said "Latimer leaneth to Cranmer, Cranmer to Ridley, and Ridley to the singularity of his own wit." [1] And though Ridley modestly would have himself regarded as far inferior to Cranmer; yet Cranmer himself declared that he owed his altered views of the Lord's Supper to conferences with Ridley.[2]

But besides this, the attempts which have been made to represent Ridley as teaching the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence," make it specially important that we should not mistake what Ridley's teaching really was. Hence our quotations from him will be somewhat copious.

I.

[3] "I acknowledge gladly the true body of Christ to be in the Lord's Supper, in such sort as the Church of Christ (which is

[1] See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 283, 284.

[2] "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my lord of London, doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and, by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors, drew me quite from my opinion." (Cranmer's Works, Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 218.) See also Lord's Supper, Appendix, p. 6. John Ab Ulmis, therefore, seems in error in ascribing Cranmer's change of views to A Lasco (Orig. Letters, ii., p. 383) who, however, may, very probably, have had some hand in it, for he had, no doubt, considerable influence with Cranmer. (See Blakeney on Prayer Book, pp. 80, 81.) Ridley's own change of view was due to the study of Bertram. (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 206, and ix.)

[3] The extracts for the most part are from the Disputation at Oxford in April, 1555, about six months before Ridley was put to death.

the spouse of Christ, and is taught of the Holy Ghost, and guided by God's word) doth acknowledge the same. But the true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper to be communicated *to the godly by grace*, and *spiritually*, as I have often shewed, and by a *sacramental signification;* but *not by the corporal presence of the body of His flesh.*" (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 236.)

II.

"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of that word '*habet*,' '*hath:*' for the sacrament *hath not grace included in it;* but *to those that receive it well*, it is turned to grace. After that manner the water in baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given: not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water." (Ibid. p. 240.)

III.

"I grant also that there is no promise made to bread and wine. But inasmuch as they are sanctified, and made *the Sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord*, they have a promise of grace annexed unto them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine*, but *to them which worthily do receive* the sacrament." (Ibid. p. 240.)

"This sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to *those that receive it worthily*, because grace is given by it, as by an instrument; *not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine.*" (Ibid. p. 241.)

IV.

[1] "I, being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's body, and drinketh His blood (THAT [2] IS, HE IS MADE EFFECTUALLY PARTAKER OF HIS PASSION); and you make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, *under the shape or form of*

[1] This from Ridley's "Examination," had before the Queen's commissioners a month before his death.

[2] The parenthesis is Ridley's. The capitals are the Editor's.

bread and wine. Now, this difference considered, to the question thus I answer, that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ *vere et realiter*, indeed and really, for *spiritually, by grace and efficacy ;* for so *every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ.* But if you mean *really and indeed*, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable *body under the forms of bread and wine*, then, in that sense, is NOT CHRIST'S BODY IN THE SACRAMENT *really and indeed.*" (Ibid. p. 274.)

V.

"This doctrine maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal presence of Christ's flesh, assumed and taken of the Word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that not by *virtue and grace* only, but also by the *whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ.*

"But SUCH A PRESENCE DISAGREETH FROM GOD'S WORD *from the rule of faith*, and cannot but draw with it many absurdities." (Ibid. p. 197.)

VI.

"It destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's Supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued UNTIL THE LORD HIMSELF SHOULD COME.[1] If, therefore, *He be now really present in the body of His flesh*, then must *the Supper cease :* for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing *past and absent.* And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and, as one of the Fathers saith,

[1] Compare Bradford :—"He biddeth us use His Supper in the remembrance of His death and passion, preaching it out 'TILL HE COME,' whereby He doth us to wit that corporally *He is not there in the form of bread :* therefore saith Paul 'TILL HE COME.'" (P. S. Edit., i., p. 394.) And Hooper, "DONEC VENERIT. Duo D. Paulus hisce verbis Ecclesiam Christi docet. . . . Christum ipsum, Cujus mortem per cœnam hanc exprimimus, *re ipsa corpore* cœnæ suæ *non adesse.* Dicit enim 'DONEC VENERIT.'" (P. S. Edit., ii., p. 448 ; see also i., p. 515.) And Becon, "The Apostles had put in these words, 'TILL HE COME, (that is to say, unto the judgment) in vain,' if Christ's natural body were present in the Supper. For, 'after His coming,' saith Theodoretus, 'we shall have no more need of symbols, signs, or sacraments, when *His very body shall appear :* and therefore said He TILL HE COME.'" (P. S. Edit., Prayers, etc., p. 370.) And Bullinger, "Paul saith, 'Declare the Lord's death TILL HE COME.' For thus we gather thereby : He, whose remembrance is repeated UNTIL HE COME *or return*, He surely is not counted to be present. (P. S. Edit., v., p. 446.) So Bishop Morton on the Eucharist, "UNTIL HIS COMING AGAIN : meaning *corporally* at the last day. Which word [UNTIL] being spoken of a last day, doth exclude your coming again of Christ in His *corporal Presence* every day," p. 217. The same argument is ably pressed by Mr. Richardson, in his lecture on Ritualism. (Hatchard, pp. 7, 8.)

'A figure is in vain where the thing figured is present.'" (Ibid. p. 199.)

VII.

"The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the Sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful Fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the holy Scripture touching the sacrament.

"But the words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the Fathers, do most effectually and plainly prove a *figurative speech* in the words of the Lord's Supper; *Ergo*, A FIGURATIVE SENSE AND MEANING *is specially to be received* in these words, 'This is my body.'" (Ibid. p. 205.)

VIII.

"I grant that Christ did both; that is, both took up His flesh with Him ascending up, and also did leave the same behind Him with us, but after a diverse manner and respect. For He took His flesh with Him, after *the true and corporal substance of His body and flesh:* again, He left the same in *mystery to the faithful in the Supper*, to be received after a spiritual communication, and by grace. *Neither is the same received in the Supper only, but also* AT OTHER TIMES, BY HEARING THE GOSPEL, AND BY FAITH.[1] For the 'bread,' which we break, is the communication of the body of Christ: and generally, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you.'" (Ibid. p. 222.)

IX.

Ward:—"He gave to us His flesh to be eaten, the which He took of the earth, in which also here He walked, etc. But He never gave His flesh to be eaten, but when He gave it at His Supper, saying, 'This is My Body.'"

"*Ergo*, in the Eucharist He gave us His flesh."

[1] Compare the following:—

Ridley:—"I am well content to grant, that Christ left much greater things to us than Elias to Eliseus, albeit he be said to have left his double spirit with him; for that the strength and grace of the body of Christ, which Christ ascending up here left with us, is the only salvation and life of all men which shall be saved: *which life* Christ hath here left unto us, to be *received by faith through the hearing of the word*, and the right administration of the sacraments. *This virtue and grace* Chrysostom, after the phrase and manner of John the evangelist, *calleth Christ's flesh*." (Ibid. p. 224.)

Ridley :—"You do allege the place of Augustine upon Psalm xcviii., where he saith, that Christ gave His flesh to be eaten which He took of the earth, and in which here He walked; inferring hereupon that Christ *never gave the same His flesh to be eaten, but only in the Eucharist :* I DENY your minor; for He gave it both in the Eucharist to be eaten, and *also otherwise*, AS WELL IN THE WORD, *as also upon the cross.*" (Ibid. p. 234.)

X.

"And I also *worship Christ* in the sacrament; but *not because He is included* in the sacrament: like as I *worship Christ also in the Scriptures*, not because He is really included in them. Notwithstanding I say, that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament; but yet *sacramentally* and *spiritually* (according to His grace) giving life, and *in that respect* REALLY, that is, according to His benediction, giving life." (Ibid. pp. 235, 236.)

XI.

"Again I say, like as the bread of the sacrament and of thanksgiving is called the body of Christ given for us; so the cup of the Lord is called the blood which sprang from the side of Christ: but that sacramental bread *is called the body*, because it is *the sacrament of His body*. Even so likewise the cup *is called the blood* also, which flowed out of Christ's side, because it is *the Sacrament of that blood* which flowed out of His side, instituted of the Lord Himself for our singular commodity, namely for our spiritual nourishment; like as baptism is ordained in water to our spiritual regeneration."

Curtop :—"The sacrament of the blood is not the blood."

Ridley :—"The *sacrament* of the blood IS *the blood;* and that is *attributed to the sacrament*, which is spoken of *the thing of the sacrament.*"

Weston :—"That which is in the chalice, is the same which flowed out of Christ's side. But there came out very blood."

"*Ergo*, There is very blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but NOT *in* THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace, and *in a sacrament.*" [1]

[1] Compare Jewel, "Defence of Apology," P. S. Edit., p. 467. "The author that beareth the name of Chrysostom saith thus, 'The *very body* of Christ is not in the holy vessels; but the *Sacrament of that Body* is therein contained.' Here have we Chrysostom against Chrysostom: the one saith 'Christ's body is in the vessels;' the other saith 'Christ's body is not in the vessels.' And as touching the mouth, St. Augustine saith, 'The body of Christ requireth the hunger of the inner man;'

Weston :—"That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"It is true; but by *grace*, and in a *sacrament*." (Ibid. pp. 237, 238.)

XII.

Watson :—". . . The Fathers say, that evil men do eat Him which descended from heaven."

Ridley :—"They eat Him indeed, but *sacramentally*. The Fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the *matter of the sacrament*, and all that same place maketh against you: and so here he cited the place. . . ."

Weston :—"Chrysostom saith, that the same punishment remaineth to them which receive the body of the Lord unworthily, as to them which crucified Him."

Ridley :—"That is, because they defile the Lord's body: for evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally*, but good men eat both the *sacrament* and the *matter of the sacrament*." (Ibid. pp. 247, 248.)

XIII.

Watson :—"But the Lamb of God lieth on the table."[1]

Ridley :—"It is *a figurative speech;* for in our mind we understand *Him which is in heaven*."

Watson :—"But He lieth there, the Greek word is κεῖται."

Ridley :—"He lieth there; that is, He is there present, *not corporally*, but He lieth there by His *operation*."

Watson :—"He lieth; but His operation lieth not."

Ridley :—"You think very grossly of the sitting or lying of the celestial Lamb on the table of the Lord: for we may not imagine any such sitting or lying upon the table, as the reason of man would judge; but all things are here to be understood

'by inward drinking I am blessed;' 'this bread entereth not into the belly;' 'to believe in Christ, that is to eat the bread of life.' Thus we see that Christ's body is in the vessels, and yet not in the vessels; in the mouth, and yet not in the mouth. These contradictions may *easily be reconciled, if a man be acquainted with the phrases of the ancient writers.* . . . As Chrysostom saith here, 'Christ's body is in the vessels;' even so Athanasius saith, 'Our Lord is in the words of the Scriptures;' St. Augustine saith, 'Holy men receive Christ in their hands and in their forehead;' St. Chrysostom saith, 'The priest beareth the Holy Ghost;' St. Augustine saith, 'The people is laid upon the communion table; the people is in the cup;' St. Gregory saith, 'Abel by signification bare Christ in his hands.' . . . Thus is Christ's *body present*, not REALLY, nor in *substance*, but ONLY *in mystery*."

[1] Quoting from Gelasius, Hist. Conc. Nic., cap. xxx., πίστει νοήσωμεν κεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τὸν ἀμνὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

spiritually. For that heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the table; but by a spiritual presence, by grace, and *not after any corporal substance of His flesh* taken of the Virgin Mary. And indeed the same canon doth very plainly teach, that the bread which is set on the table is material bread; and therefore it (the canon, I mean) commandeth that we should not creep on the ground in our cogitation, to those things which are set before us; as who should say, what other things are they (as much as pertaineth to their true substance) than bread and wine? 'But rather,' saith the canon, 'lifting up our minds into heaven, let us consider with faith the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, sitting or lying upon the table.' 'For a lifted up faith,' saith he, 'seeth Him which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, after the true manner of a body set by grace on the Lord's table, and taking away the sins of the world. For I think you mean not so; as though the Lamb did lie there prostrate with His members spread upon the table.'" (Ibid. pp. 248, 249.)

XIV.

Ridley:—"Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word, 'really,' whether it be to be taken as the logicians term it, 'transcendenter;' that is, most generally; and so it may signify *any manner of thing which belongeth to the body of Christ, by any means: after which sort* we also grant Christ's body to be *really* in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as in disputation, if occasion be given, shall be declared), or whether it be taken to signify the *very same thing, having body, life, and soul*, which was assumed and taken of the Word of God into the unity of person. *In which sense*, SINCE THE BODY OF CHRIST IS REALLY IN HEAVEN, *because of the true manner of His body*, it *may* NOT be said to be here in the earth." (Ibid. p. 196.)

XV.

Ridley:—"We do handle the signs *reverently:* but we *worship* the sacrament *as a sacrament*, not as a thing signified by the sacrament."

Glyn:—"What is the symbol or *sacrament?*"

Ridley:—"*Bread.*"

Glyn:—"Ergo, We worship bread."

Ridley:—"There is a deceit in this word 'Adoramus.' We

worship the symbols, when *reverently we handle them.* We worship Christ wheresoever we perceive His benefits; but we understand His benefits to be greatest in the sacrament."

Glyn:—"So I may fall down before the bench here, and worship Christ; and if any man ask me what I do, I may answer, I worship Christ."

Ridley:—"We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist. And if you mean the *external sacrament;* I say, that also is to be worshipped[1] *as a sacrament.*" (Ibid. p. 236.)

XVI.

Ridley:—"Of Christ's REAL PRESENCE there may be a *double understanding.* If you take the REAL PRESENCE of Christ according to *the real and corporal substance which He took of the Virgin,* THAT PRESENCE *being in heaven* CANNOT BE ON THE EARTH ALSO. But if you mean a REAL PRESENCE, 'secundum rem aliquam quæ ad corpus Christi pertinet,' *i.e.*, according to *something that appertaineth to Christ's body, certes* the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to *that presence.*

[1] It is sufficiently obvious that the word *worship* is used here in that lower sense which still clings to the word *worshipful.* So Sir John Cheke writing to Parker says: "The University hath not done so great honour to Mr. Bucer, as honesty and *worship* to themselves." (See Correspondence of Parker in P. S. Edit., p. 44. Compare our translation of δόξα in Luke xix. 10. See also note in Blakeney on Common Prayer, p. 450.)

At the Hampton Court Conference, "Dr. Reynolds excepted at those words in the Office of Matrimony; 'with my body I thee worship.' The king, perusing the place, said, he was made to believe this phrase imported no less than divine worship; but upon enquiry he found the words sink to a much lower and inoffensive sense: 'A gentleman of worship' being a customary expression with the English; and thus it agrees with the Apostle's precept of giving honour to the wife, etc." (Collier's "Eccles. Hist.," vii., p. 294.) With Ridley's words here may be compared those of Cranmer: "As for 'the reverent use of man's mouth' in the Lord's holy Supper, the bread and wine outwardly must be reverently received with the mouth, because of the things thereby represented, which by faith be received inwardly in our hearts and minds." (On Lord's Supper, p. 174, P. S. Edit.) And these sayings of Ridley and Cranmer may be regarded as furnishing the only answer which can be needful to the argument, that the Church of England must be understood to teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, because of the care she takes for the reverent treatment of the consecrated elements, requiring them to be covered "with a fair linen cloth;" and directing "the priest, with such other communicants as he shall call unto him . . . immediately after the blessing, reverently" to "eat and drink" what may remain. (See Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 229-232. See also "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," pp. 307, 315, and Grueber, "Reply to Dr. Heurtley," p. 18.) Cranmer and Ridley both alike rejected the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. But both alike also held that the outward elements in the Eucharist were to be "worshipped" or "reverently used." In like manner the author of the Diallacticon, (quoted in Oxford Catena, p. 24,) says, "A double worship is defined, one, that which we pay to God; the other, that which we give to signs and divine mysteries."

Wherefore Christ's Body, *after that sort*, is here present to us in the Lord's Supper; by grace I say, as Epiphanius speaketh it.". . .

Ridley:—"Master doctor, this argument is nothing worth. I do not so straitly tie Christ up in heaven, that He may not come into the earth at His pleasure: for when He will, He may come down from heaven, and be on the earth, as it liketh Himself. Howbeit I DO AFFIRM, that it is NOT POSSIBLE *for Him to be* BOTH IN HEAVEN AND EARTH at one time." (Ibid. p. 213.)

XVII.

"If[1] (I say) the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substance of bread is the material substance in the sacrament of Christ's blessed body, . . . then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which He took of the Virgin Mary, *is in heaven*, where it reigneth now in glory, and *not here* inclosed *under the form of bread*. Then that *godly honour*, which is only due unto God the Creator, *may* not be done unto the creature without idolatry and sacrilege, IS NOT TO BE DONE UNTO THE HOLY SACRAMENT. Then also the *wicked*, I mean the impenitent, murderer, adulterer, or such-like, DO[2] NOT RECEIVE THE NATURAL SUBSTANCE OF THE BLESSED BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST." (Ibid. p. 12.)

XVIII.

"By grace (I say,) that is, by the gift of this life, (mentioned in John;) and the *properties of the same* meet for our pilgrimage

[1] This and the following are from "A brief declaration of the Lord's Supper," written by Ridley in the time of his imprisonment.

[2] The reader will not fail to mark here Ridley's *distinct denial* of the reception of the "Res Sacramenti" by the wicked, and herein also the true explanation of the words quoted above, where he said that they eat the Body of Christ *sacramentally*, (*i.e.*, as giving to the *Sacrament* the name of *the matter of the Sacrament*. See below at the end of this paper.) Archdeacon Martin has said, "The citation of Bishop Ridley for this doctrine, (*i.e.*, the reception by the wicked) is, as if one should cite the noble army of martyrs in favour of a denial of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Answer to the Bishop of Salisbury, p. 219.)

To make Ridley's views on this matter still more unmistakeable, let the reader be asked to compare the following.

"It [*i.e.*, this carnal presence] maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons, and constraineth men to confess many *absurdities*. For it affirmeth, that whoremongers and murderers, yea, and (as some of them hold opinion) the *wicked and faithless*, mice, rats, and dogs also, *may receive the very real and corporal body of the Lord*, wherein the fulness of the Spirit of light and grace dwelleth; contrary to the manifest words of Christ in six places and sentences of John vi." (Ridley's Works, p. 199.)

here upon earth, *the same body of Christ is here present with us*. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's Word and His Sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of Righteousness." (Ibid. p. 13.)

XIX.

"I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtle shifts: the one is, by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice, offered up once for all." . . . "The meaning of the Fathers was . . . that the WHOLE *substance of our* SACRIFICE which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and shewing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which once only, and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption." (Ibid. pp. 210, 211.)

XX.

"The[1] form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish Mass, unto the right use

[1] This and the following are taken from Ridley's "Reasons" accompanying his "Injunctions," 1550, in which was forbidden the "*shewing the Sacrament* openly before distribution, or *making any elevation thereof;* ringing of the sacrying bell, or *setting any light on the Lord's board;*" and in which the curates, church-wardens, and questmen were exhorted "to erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest tabie, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel, as shall be thought most meet." (See pp. 319, 320.) "And so appointed he the form of a right table to be used in his diocese, and in the Church of Paul brake down the wall standing then by the high altar's side." (Fox. See Ridley's Works, p. 324.) King Edward's letter may be seen in Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., Appendix vi., p. 507; requiring and specially charging, and commanding "to give substantial order throughout all your diocese, that, with all diligence, all the altars in every church or chapel be taken down; and instead thereof, a table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel." Early in Elizabeth's reign the bishops drew up a paper of reasons against altars; and the Queen issued injunctions "that the holy table, in every church, be decently made and set up in the place where the altar stood . . . and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed, in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants." (See Cardwell's "Doc. Annals," p. 201.)

of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to *make sacrifice* upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come unto the Lord's board, what do we come for?—*to sacrifice Christ again*, and to crucify Him again, or to feed upon Him that was once only crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His body, and spiritually to drink his blood (which is *the true use* of the Lord's Supper), then no man can deny but *the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board, than the form of an altar.*" (Ibid. p. 322.)

XXI.

"The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called *θυσιαστήριον quasi sacrificii locus.* But now both the law and *the sacrifices* thereof *do cease:* wherefore the *form of the altar* used in the altar *ought to cease* withal." (Ibid. p. 323.)

XXII.

Ridley:—"As for the taking down of the altars, it was done upon just considerations, for that they seemed to come too nigh to the Jews' usage: neither was the Supper of the Lord at any time better ministered, [or] more duly received, than in those latter days when all things were brought to the rites and usage of the primitive Church."

Lincoln:—"A goodly receiving, I promise you, to set an oyster-table [1] instead of an altar, and to come from puddings at Westminster, to receive: and, yet when your table was constituted, you could never be content, in placing the same now east, now north, now one way, now another, until it pleased God of His goodness to place it clean out of the church."

Ridley:—"Your lordship's unreverend terms do not elevate the thing. Perhaps some men come more devoutly from pud-

[1] Compare Becon, "Heretofore we were taught to beat down the idolatrous and heathenish altars which Antichrist of Rome, intending to set up *a new priesthood* and *a strange sacrifice* for sin, commanded to be built up. . . . But now, the sacrificing sorcerers shame not, both in their private talk and in their open sermons, spitefully to call the Lord's table *an oyster board;* and therefore have taken out of the temples those *seemly tables* which we, following the examples of Thy dearly beloved Son, and of the Primitive Church, used at the ministration of the Holy Communion, and they have brought in again their altars: and upon those they sacrifice and offer daily, say they, . . . Thy dear Son Christ for the sins of the people." (Supplication for the Restoring of God's Word. Works, P. S. Edit., Prayers, etc., p. 229.)

dings, than other men now do from other things."[1] (Ibid. p. 281.)

LATIMER.

Hugh Latimer was born in 1470. In 1535 he was appointed Bishop of Worcester. He resigned his bishopric and retired into the country on the passing of the Six Articles. He was very popular in the reign of Edward VI. On Mary's accession he was tried with Ridley for heresy. The articles against him were these: "That thou hast openly affirmed, defended, and maintained, that the true and natural

[1] The following is from Ridley's last Farewell, written probably between October 1st and October 16th, when he was burned: "It was during this interval that Lord Dacre offered ten thousand pounds to the queen if she would spare Ridley's life." (Ed., P. S. Edit., p. 395, note.) "This Church of England had of late, of the infinite goodness and abundant grace of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true and sincere word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's holy Sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same taught in the holy catechism, to have been learned of all true Christians. This church had also a true and sincere form and manner of the Lord's Supper, wherein, according to Jesus Christ's own ordinance and holy institution, Christ's commandments were executed and done. For upon the bread and wine set upon the Lord's table thanks were given, the commemoration of the Lord's death was had, the bread in the remembrance of Christ's body torn upon the Cross was broken, and the cup in the remembrance of Christ's blood shed was distributed, and both communicated unto all that were present and would receive them; and also they were exhorted of the minister so to do. All was done openly in the vulgar tongue, so that everything might be both easily heard and plainly understood of all the people to God's high glory; and the edification of the whole church. This church had of late the whole Divine service, all common and public prayers ordained to be said and heard in the common congregation, not only framed and fashioned to the true vein of Holy Scripture; but also all things so set forth, according to the commandment of the Lord and St. Paul's doctrine, for the people's edification, in their vulgar tongue. It had also holy wholesome Homilies, in commendation of the principal virtues which are commended in Scripture; and likewise other homilies, against the most pernicious and capital vices that useth, (alas!) to reign in this realm of England. This church had, in matters of controversy, Articles so penned and framed after the Holy Scripture, and grounded upon the true understanding of God's Word, that in short time, if they had been universally received, they should have been able to have set in Christ's church much concord and unity in Christ's true religion, and to have expelled many false errors and heresies wherewith this church (alas!) was almost overgone. But, (alas!) of late . . . in the stead of the Lord's holy table they give the people, with much solemn disguising, a thing which they call their Mass; but in deed and in truth it is a very masking and mockery of the true Supper of the Lord, or rather I may call it a crafty juggling, whereby these false thieves and jugglers have bewitched the minds of the simple people, that they have brought them from the true worship of GOD unto *pernicious idolatry;* and make them to believe that to be Christ our Lord and Saviour, which, indeed, is neither God nor man, nor hath any life in itself; but in substance is the creature of bread and wine, *and in use of the Lord's table is the sacrament of Christ's body and blood;* and for this holy use, for the which the *Lord hath ordained them* in His table to *represent unto us* His blessed body torn upon the Cross for us and His blood there shed, it pleased Him *to call them* His body and blood, which understanding Christ *declareth to be His true meaning,* when he saith, 'Do this in the remembrance of Me.'" (Ibid. pp. 399-401.)

body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar, and that in the sacrament of the Altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine." Latimer replied, "After a corporal being, which the Romish Church furnisheth, Christ's body and blood is not in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine." He was burnt at Oxford, October 16th, 1555, with Ridley, to whom he said, "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust, shall never be put out."

The first four of the following Extracts are taken from the Disputation at Oxford, April, 1554.

I.

"The conclusions whereunto I must answer are these:—

1. "The first is, that in the sacrament of the altar, by the virtue of God's Word pronounced by the priest, there is really and naturally the very body of Christ present, as it was conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds of bread and wine. And, in like manner, His blood [in the cup].

"To these I answer:

"Concerning the first conclusion, methinketh it is set forth with certain new terms, lately found, that be obscure, and do not sound according to the Scripture. Nevertheless, however I understand it, thus do I answer, although not without peril [of my life]. I say, That there is *none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence;* and this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as the presence by the which we both abide in Christ, and Christ in us, to the obtaining of eternal life, if we persevere [in His true Gospel]. And the same presence may be called a *real presence*, [because to the *faithful believer* there is the real, or spiritual body of Christ]: which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the Anabaptist, to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare and naked sign. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected [from among God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith; and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of Antichrist.]" (Remains, P. S. Edit., pp. 251, 252.)

II.

Weston:—"The time hath been when you said Mass full devoutly."

Latimer :—"Yea, I cry God mercy heartily for it."

Weston :—"Where learned you this newfangleness?"

Latimer :—"I have long sought for the truth in this matter of the Sacrament, and have not been of this mind past seven years: and my lord of Canterbury's book hath especially confirmed my judgment herein. If I could remember all therein contained, I would not fear to answer any man in this matter." (Ibid. p. 265.)

III.

Tresham :—"Now, that the truth may the better appear, . . . here I ask of you, whether Christ, speaking these words, did mean of His flesh to be eaten with the mouth, or of the spiritual eating of the same?"

Latimer :—"I answer, (as Augustine understandeth,) that Christ meant of the spiritual eating of His flesh."

Tresham :—"Of what flesh meant Christ? His true flesh, or no?"

Latimer :—"Of His true flesh, *spiritually to be eaten*, in the Supper, *by faith*, and not corporally." (Ibid. p. 266.)

IV.

"He gave not His body to be received with the mouth, but He gave the *Sacrament of His body* to be *received with the mouth*: He gave *the Sacrament to the mouth, His* BODY TO THE MIND." (Ibid. p. 267.)

V.

"He sheweth unto us how we shall eat Him, in what manner and form; namely, *spiritually*, to *our great comfort*: so that whosoever eateth the mystical bread, and drinketh the mystical wine worthily, according to the ordinance of Christ, *he receiveth surely the very body and blood of Christ spiritually*, as it shall be most comfortable unto his soul. He *eateth with the mouth of his soul*, and *digesteth with the stomach of his soul*, the body of Christ. And to be short: *whosoever believeth* in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and confidence in Him, *he eateth and drinketh Him*: for the *spiritual eating is the right eating* to everlasting life; not the corporal eating, as the Capernaites understood it. For that same corporal eating on which they set their minds, hath no commodities at all: it is a spiritual meat that feedeth our souls." (Sermons, P. S. Edit., pp. 458, 459.)

VI.

"So likewise go to the Lord's Supper: when the bread is consecrated, when the words are spoken over it, then it is such an office that it *beareth the name of the body and blood of Christ.* Like as the magistrates because of their office are called Dii, 'gods,' so the bread presenteth His body, so that we go unto it worthily, and receive it with *a good faith. Then* we be assured that *we feed upon Him spiritually.* And like as the bread nourisheth the body, so THE SOUL FEEDETH *upon the very body and blood of Christ by faith,* BY BELIEVING HIM TO BE A SAVIOUR *which delivered man from his sin.*" (Sermon in Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 127.)

VII.

"So that it is needless to have such offerers. . . . What meaneth St. Paul, when he said, 'they that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel'? Whereas he should (rather) have said, The Lord hath ordained, that they that sacrifice [1] at Mass, should live of the sacrificing. . . . For I am sure, if God would have had a new kind of sacrificing priest at Mass, then He or some of His apostles would have made some mention thereof in their Master, Christ's will. . . . But He spake never a word of sacrificing, or saying of Mass. . . . Therefore, sacrificing priests should now cease for ever: [2] for now all men ought to offer their own bodies a quick sacrifice, holy and acceptable before God." (Ibid. pp. 254, 255.)

VIII.

[3] "If Christ offered in His Supper, for whom, I pray you? For all. Then His latter oblation made on the cross cannot be thought to be done for all men, for it was not done for them for whom the oblation was made in the Supper; except, peradventure, He offered twice for the self-same, and that should argue the unperfectness of the sacrifice. 'Feed ye, as much as in you lieth, the flock of Christ:' nay, sacrifice rather for the flock of Christ, if the matter be as it is pretended; and it is

[1] Cf. Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 107; and Geste, in Dugdale's Life, p. 113. Contrast "The Church of the World," in which is lamented "the practical change which has turned our clergy from a sacrificing priesthood into a preaching ministry" (p. 236.)

[3] This is from the conference between Ridley and Latimer (given in Ridley's Words, P. S. Edit., p. 103, sq.) during the time of their imprisonment.

marvel that Peter did forget so high an office, seeing in these days sacrificing is so much esteemed, preaching almost nothing at all. Who art thou, if thou ceasest to feed? A good catholic. But who art thou, if thou ceasest to sacrifice and say mass? At the least, an heretic! From whence come these perverse judgments, except, peradventure, they think that in sacrificing they feed, and then what needeth a learned pastor? Seeing no man is so foolish, but he can soon learn to sacrifice and say mass. Paul wrote two epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus, two clergymen. He made also a long sermon *ad clerum*, but not one word of this mass sacrifice, which could not have been done, if there had been such a one, and so highly to be esteemed. I have read over of late the New Testament three or four times deliberately; yet can I not find there neither the Popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass. Christ could not be offered, but propitiatorily; yet now, *Hoc facite*, 'Do this,' must be as much as to say, 'Sacrifice and offer My body under a piece of bread,' available, but we cannot tell how much. Ah! thieves, have ye robbed the realm with your sacrifice of lands and goods; and now cannot tell how much your sacrifice is available?" (Latimer, in Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 112.)

Ponet.

John Ponet (or Poynet, or Poinet), born 1516, was eminent among the Reforming Theologians of the reign of Edward VI. The Catechism, called Edward the Sixth's Catechism, was from his pen. It was published by Royal Authority under the advice of Cranmer and Ridley. He was made Bishop of Rochester in 1550, and removed to Winchester in 1551. On the accession of Mary he retired to Strassburg, where he died in 1556.

We take the name of Bishop Ponet next after Ridley and Latimer, on account of the importance attached to his testimony, and the claim which has been made upon it by those who maintain the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

I.

"And whosoever *eateth this flesh and drinketh this blood* with the *mouth of belief, that this very flesh of Christ was put to death for him, and this very blood was once shed for him*, he shall have everlasting life, and the Lord will raise him again

at the latter day." (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 783.)

II.

"There is another kind of eating of Christ's body, and drinking of His blood, and that is called eating and drinking *sacramentaliter*, sacramentally. And we eat Christ on this fashion as oft as we join the outward signs of bread and wine, (that is to say) the Sacrament of the Holy Communion with our faith and inward belief, receiving a visible testimony of our inward belief in the face of the congregation." (Ibid. pp. 783, 784.)

III.

"Wherefore thus I may conclude, he that believeth, eateth; and HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT, EATETH NOT, *although he eat the sacrament every day in the week*." (Ibid. p. 784.)

IV.

"And for the maintenance of this their erroneous and antichristian opinion they will not stick to say, that Christ's body may be in sundry places at one time, granting that it may be at Rome, at Paris, in London, in Canterbury, and in a thousand other diverse places at once.

"Whereas if ye read the Scriptures through, ye shall *never find*, that Christ's BODY was in TWO *places at* ONE *time*, or that after His resurrection it appeared in TWO *sundry places at* ONE *time*." (Ibid. p. 785.)

V.

"We must take heed (saith St. Austin) that we do not so affirm the divinity of His manhood, that we take away thereby of the TRUTH of His BODY. And St. Austin doth plainly affirm that this body must be in one place of heaven, whereas it pleaseth His Divine Majesty to be." (Ibid. p. 785.)

VI.

"Why, but what mean I to say so? This gear seemeth to be quite contrary to all that ever I have said before; His body is in heaven, and His body is present at the ministration of the sacrament of His Supper. These sayings seem to be directly

repugnant the one of them to the other. To put you out of doubt on this point, ye shall understand that even as the sun which is far off distant is absent from mine eye and yet is present to my sight, even so is Christ's body ABSENT FROM MY MOUTH and yet PRESENT TO MY BELIEF. For my belief ascendeth into heaven, even to that body of Christ which sitteth there at the right hand of God the Father, which is His very true and no fantastical body, flesh, blood, and bone as it was born of the Virgin Mary.

"And when I receive the Holy Communion, *Mea conversatio est in cœlis:* my conversation is in heaven: where Christ's body is even so present to my faith as the sun is present to my sight, and as the bread and wine be present to my mouth. *So that if I have no faith,* CHRIST IS NOT PRESENT TO ME *when I receive the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.* If I have faith, Christ's body being in heaven in one only place, is PRESENT TO MY FAITH; and when I receive the Holy Communion I embrace Him by faith, even flesh, blood and bone as He was born of the Virgin Mary. And so do all men throughout the whole world hang upon Him, and comfort themselves with that only body, being in one place of heaven, though they be dispersed into never so many sundry places throughout the world." (Ibid. p. 787.)

DIALLACTICON.

The following Extracts from the Diallacticon are given in this place, because it has been commonly ascribed to Ponet. But it was certainly not his, and Dean Goode has shewn that there can be little doubt that the author was Sir Anthony Cooke.[1] (On Eucharist, ii., pp. 777, sq.)

I.

"And this also doth make much the more, that the sacrament is most worthy to have the name of the true body and blood, seeing not only outwardly it sheweth forth a figure and image of it, but also inwardly it draweth with it a hid and secret natural property of the same body, that is to say, a virtue that giveth life: so that it cannot now be thought a vain figure, or

[1] "Whose private views on this subject are certainly not a test of what is the doctrine of our Church." (Goode, p. 782.) "The doctrine advocated in the Diallacticon, is not that of a Real Presence of the body and blood themselves in or under the Elements, but only the Presence of their virtue or influence." (Ibid. p. 778.)

the sign of a thing clean absent, but the very body of the Lord, divine indeed and spiritual, but present in grace, full of virtue, mighty in operation. And it happeneth often, that the names of the THINGS *themselves* be given to their VIRTUE and STRENGTH. We say leaven is in the whole lump, whereas a small quantity of leaven cannot spread so far abroad, but the strength and sharpness of the leaven. We say that the fire doth warm us, when the heat of the fire doth it, we being a good way off from the fire. Likewise that the sun is present, doth lighten, burneth, nourisheth, when indeed the HEAT of the sun doth it, and the SUN HIMSELF *cannot* go out of his sphere. So is a king said to be in all his realm, because of the power of his dominion." (Quoted from "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 778, 779.)

II.

"When it is received (as the same Fathers have diligently observed), with this distinction between the proper or assumed body of Christ, and *His symbolical body* as *the Sacrament of His body*, we do not err against the analogy of faith, which is not at all destroyed, inasmuch as we assign to each body its own attributes. For we say that the proper and assumed body is in place, and is circumscribed by space, *after the manner of* A TRUE BODY. . . . Nothing prevents the truth of the *symbolical body* notwithstanding, because it is a *divine* and *spiritual thing*, from being as widely diffused as the celebration of the sacrament. . . . Besides which *no absurdities* accompany this doctrine, as many do the gross *transubstantiation*, AS WELL AS THE CARNAL CONJUNCTION WITH THE BREAD."[1] (Quoted from Catena [Parker, Oxford], p. 27.)

[1] The following is a quotation from the posthumous Charge of Archbishop Longley, who attributes (by error) the Diallacticon to Ponet: "Bishop Poynet is often quoted as great authority by those who hold high views as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But he too gives us a clue to his real meaning in the following passage, whatever strong expression he may elsewhere have used in another direction. 'Ipsa Cypriani verba satis indicant, quàm non sequenda sit litera in his quæ de hoc mysterio dicuntur, quàm procul arcendus est carnis sensus, et ad sensum spiritualem omnia referenda, huic pani Divinæ virtutis præsentiam adesse, vitæ æternæ effectum, Divinam infundi essentiam, verba spiritum et vitam esse, spirituale documentum tradi, hoc corpus, hunc sanguinem et carnem, hanc substantiam Corporis, non communi more, nec ut humana ratio dictat, accipi oportere, sed ita nominari, existimari, credi, propter eximios quosdam effectus, virtutes, et proprietates conjunctas, quæ corpori et sanguini Christi naturâ insunt, nempe quòd pascat animas nostras, et vivificet simul, et corpora ad resurrectionem et immortalitatem præparet.'" (p. 36.)

PHILPOT.

John Philpot, born in 1511, a great Hebrew scholar, was admitted "true fellow" of New College, Oxford, in 1534. He spent some time in foreign travel, and on his return gave evidence of the change in his religious views. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester would have suppressed his teaching, but could not. In Edward's reign he was made Archdeacon of Winchester. In Mary's reign he was imprisoned, and burnt at Smithfield, Dec. 18, 1555. In Bonner's address to him, he said, "You have offended and trespassed against the Sacrament of the Altar, denying the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood to be there, affirming also material bread and material wine to be in the sacrament, and not the substance of the body and blood of Christ." (See Examination, P. S. Edit., p. 151.)

The following Extracts are from Philpot's Examinations before the Queen's Commissioners, commencing October, 1555, the same year in which he suffered.

I.

"But bodily to *be present*, and bodily to *be absent;* to be *on earth*, and to be *in heaven*, and all at *one present time;* be things CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF A HUMAN BODY: ergo, it cannot be said of the human body of Christ, that the selfsame body is both in heaven, and also in earth at one instant, either VISIBLY OR INVISIBLY." (Examinations, P. S. Edit., p. 208.)

II.

"I allow the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica*, and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach; and THE DOCTRINE TAUGHT AND PREACHED IN KING EDWARD'S DAYS WAS ALSO ACCORDING TO THE SAME. And are ye not ashamed to persecute me and others for your Church's sake, which is Babylonical, and contrary to the true Catholic Church?" (Ibid. p. 153.)

III.

"Wherefore, unless you can declare by the word, that Christ is otherwise present with us than spiritually and sacramentally by grace, as He hath taught us, you *pretend* THE OMNIPOTENCY OF GOD IN VAIN."

London:—"Why, wilt thou not say that Christ is *really present* in the Sacrament? or do you deny it?"

Philpot :—"I deny not that Christ is *really in the sacrament* TO THE RECEIVER THEREOF according to Christ's institution." (Ibid. p. 62.)

IV.

Chedsey :—"Why, then you would not have it to be the body of Christ, *unless it be received?*"

Philpot :—"No, VERILY, it is NOT the very body of Christ *to any other*, but such as *condignly* RECEIVE THE SAME *after his institution*." (Ibid. p. 67.)

V.

Chamberlain :—"I pray you, my Lord, let me ask him one question. WHAT KIND OF PRESENCE *in the sacrament* (duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance) do you allow?"

Philpot :—"If any come worthily to receive, then do I *confess* THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST wholly to be, *with all* THE FRUITS OF HIS PASSION, *unto the said* WORTHY RECEIVER, by the Spirit of God, and that Christ is thereby joined to him and he to Christ." (Ibid. p. 68.)

VI.

"But the sacraments be to be considered according to the word which Christ spake of them; of the which, 'Take ye, and eat ye' be some of the chief, concurrent to the making of the same, without the which there can be no sacraments." (Ibid. pp. 61, 69.)

VII.

Philpot :—"Error, that I know, I hold none: of the Catholic Church I am sure I am."

Worcester :—"The Catholic Church doth acknowledge a REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the sacrament, and so will not you."

Philpot :—"That is not so: for I acknowledge a VERY ESSENTIAL PRESENCE in the sacrament duly used."

Worcester :—"What! a real presence?"

Philpot :—"Yea, A REAL PRESENCE *by the Spirit of God in the* right administration." (Ibid. p. 130.)

VIII.

Philpot :—"I do acknowledge (as I have said) a REAL PRESENCE *of the sacrament*, in the due administration thereof, to THE WORTHY RECEIVERS, by the spirit of God. (Ibid. p. 132.)

Chedsey:—". . . I hear say you do confess A REAL PRESENCE: but I will be hanged, if you will abide by it: you will deny it by and by."

Philpot:—"That I have said, I cannot deny; neither intend, whatsoever you say."

Chedsey:—"If there be A REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, then EVIL MEN RECEIVE CHRIST: which thing you will not grant, I am sure."

Philpot:—"I deny the argument; for I do not grant in THE SACRAMENT by transubstantiation ANY REAL PRESENCE, as you falsely imagine; but in *the due administration to* THE WORTHY RECEIVERS." (Ibid. p. 133.)

IX.

Christopherson:—"Doth not St. Augustine call it the sacrament of the altar? How say you to that?"

Philpot:—"That maketh nothing for the probation of your sacrament. For so he, with other ancient writers, do call the Holy Communion or Supper of the Lord, in respect that it is the sacrament of the sacrifice which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, the which sacrifice all the altars and sacrifices done upon the altars in the old law did prefigure and shadow; the which pertaineth nothing to your sacrament hanging upon your altars of lime and stone."

Christopherson:—"No doth? I pray you what signifieth 'altar'?"

Philpot:—"Not as you falsely take it materially, but for the sacrifice of the altar of the cross." (Ibid. p. 119.)

BRADFORD.

John Bradford, born probably about 1510, entered the Inner Temple as a student of common law, 1547, when his character underwent a great change, through the instrumentality, it is said, of his friend Sampson. A year after Ridley invited him to be a Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1549. In 1550 Ridley, then Bishop of London, obtained for him a license to preach, made him one of his chaplains, and lodged him in his own house. In 1551 he was appointed one of the six chaplains of Edward VI., chosen to be "*itineraries*, to preach sound doctrine in all the remotest parts of the kingdom." On the accession of Mary he "still continued diligent in preaching, until he was unjustly deprived of both his office and liberty." He wrote to the men of Lancashire and Cheshire from his prison—"The chief thing which I

am condemned for as an heretic is, because I deny in the sacrament of the altar (which is not Christ's Supper but a plain perversion, as the Papists now use it) to be a real, natural, and corporal presence of Christ's body and blood under the forms and accidents of bread and wine; that is, because I deny transubstantiation, which is the darling of the devil, and daughter and heir to Antichrist's religion." "He endured the flame as a fresh gale of wind on a hot summer's day, without any reluctancy, confirming by his death the truth of that doctrine he had so diligently and powerfully preached during his life."

The first extract is from a Sermon on the Lord's Supper, which appears to have been submitted to Ridley "to peruse and judge thereof." In returning it, Ridley wrote (1554) "Blessed be God that hath given you liberty . . . that you may use your pen to His glory, and to the comfort, as I hear say, of many." (See Sermons, etc., P. S. Edit., p. 82.)

I.

"If there be no substance of bread in the sacrament, but transubstantiation, *then Christ's body is* RECEIVED OF THE UNGODLY and eaten with their teeth: which is *not only against St. Austin* calling this speech, 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man,' etc., to be 'a figurative speech;' but also AGAINST THE PLAIN SCRIPTURES, which affirm them to dwell in Christ and Christ in them, and they *to have everlasting life that eat Him;* which *the wicked have not*, although they eat the sacrament. 'He that eateth of this bread,' saith Christ, 'shall live for evermore.' Therefore *they* EAT NOT CHRIST'S BODY, but, as Paul saith, 'they eat judgment and damnation;' which I trow be *another manner of thing than Christ's body*. And this doth St. Austin affirm, saying, '*None* DO EAT CHRIST'S BODY, which is not in the body of Christ;' that is, as he expoundeth it, 'in whom Christ dwelleth not, and he in Christ:' which thing THE WICKED DO NOT, because they want *faith and the Holy Spirit, which be* THE MEANS WHEREBY CHRIST IS RECEIVED." (Sermons, etc., Parker Society Edition, p. 91.)

II.

[1] "'Why,' quoth he, 'didst thou not deny Christ's presence in the sacrament?'

[1] This is from Bradford's last examination, Jan. 30, 1555. He was condemned the next day, and burnt July 1.

"'No,' quoth Bradford, 'I never denied nor taught, but that TO FAITH whole *Christ's body and blood* was as present as bread and wine TO THE DUE RECEIVER.'

"'Yea, but dost thou not believe that Christ's body naturally and *really is there, under the form of bread and wine?*'

"'My lord,' quoth Bradford, 'I believe *Christ is present there* to the FAITH *of the due receiver:* as for transubstantiation, I plainly and flatly tell you, I believe it not.'

"Here was Bradford called *diabolus*, 'a slanderer;' 'For *we ask* NO QUESTION,' quoth the lord-chancellor, 'of transubstantiation, but of CHRIST'S BODILY PRESENCE.'

"'Why,' quoth Bradford, 'I deny not *His presence to* THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, but *deny* that He is INCLUDED IN THE BREAD, or that the bread is transubstantiated.'

"'If He be not included,' quoth the Bishop of Worcester, 'how is He then present?'

"'Forsooth,' quoth Bradford, 'my faith knoweth how, though my tongue cannot express it, nor you otherwise than by faith hear it, or understand it.'

"Here was much ado now, one doctor starting up and speaking this, another that, and the lord-chancellor talking much of Luther, Zuinglius, and Œcolampadius: but still Bradford kept them at this point, that *Christ is* PRESENT TO FAITH, and that there is no transubstantiation nor *including of Christ in the bread;* but all this would not serve them.

"Therefore another bishop asked this question,—*Whether the* WICKED MAN RECEIVED CHRIST'S VERY BODY OR NO? And Bradford answered plainly, 'No.' Whereat the lord-chancellor made a long oration, how that *it could not be that Christ* WAS PRESENT, except that the *evil man receive Him.*

"But Bradford put his oration away in few words, that grace was at that present offered to his lordship, although he received it not: 'So that,' quoth he, '*the receiving* MAKETH NOT THE PRESENCE, as your lordship would affirm; but *God's grace, truth, and power, is the cause of* THE PRESENCE, the which the *wicked* THAT LACKETH FAITH CANNOT RECEIVE.'" (Ibid. pp. 488, 489.)

III.

[1] "'Your Church hath taken something too much upon her to excommunicate me for that which, by the testimony of my

[1] The two following extracts are from the Conference with Harpsfield, Feb. 16, 1555.

lord of Duresme in his book of the Sacrament lately put forth, was free of many an hundred years after Christ, to believe or not believe.'

"'What is that?' quoth he.

"'Transubstantiation,' said I.

"'Why, you are not condemned therefore only,' quod he.

"'*Yes*,' quoth I, '*that am I*, and *because I deny that* WICKED MEN DO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.'[1]

"'No,' quoth he, 'you agree not with us *in the presence*, nor in nothing else.'

"'How you believe,' quoth I, 'you know: for my part, *I confess a presence of whole Christ*, God and man, *to the faith of the receiver*.'

[1] In Bradford's case the articles of accusation appear to have been somewhat exceptional. Our Reformers were usually condemned—(1) For denying the real corporal presence; (2) For maintaining that bread and wine remain; (3) For denying the sacrifice of the mass. In some cases the *third* charge was omitted, in some cases also the *second*; the *first*—the denial of the corporal presence—seems regularly to have *stood first*. Tyndale has said: "The first [*i.e.* the Papists], though they have slain so many in and for defence of their opinion, yet they are ready to receive the second sort [*i.e.* the Lutherans] to fellowship, not *greatly striving* with them or *abhorring the presence of bread and wine with the very body and blood*, so that they yet by that means may keep him there still." (Doctrinal Treatises, pp. 367, 368.) Mr. Garbett, in his valuable lecture, "The doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the Key-note of the Reformation" (Hatchards), says: "The articles of accusation in the most prominent cases of martyrdom have been providentially preserved to us, and we find them again and again to turn on the denial of the corporal presence in the first place, and the denial of transubstantiation only in the second. The first stands as the prominent charge, and in many cases the whole charge; and the other was but the sequel to it. The two accusations are embodied in separate articles, and the corporal presence is invariably first, as it must necessarily be. . . . As a matter of fact, not only where the two questions are both made the ground of accusation is the denial of the corporal presence the prominent charge, but there are numerous instances where the denial of the corporal presence is the only ground of accusation, and transubstantiation is not directly mentioned; while if we turn to the great leaders of the time—to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and their ever-memorable disputations at Oxford—still the fact is the same. With each of them three propositions were proposed for discussion, and with some slight verbal variations they are in substance the same in each case. Here again it is the corporal presence on which the whole argument depends. The propositions maintained against Cranmer were as follows:—'First, In the sacrament of the altar is the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His blood, present really under the forms of bread and wine, by virtue of God's word pronounced by the priest. Secondly, There remaineth no substance of bread and wine after the consecration, nor any other substance but the substance of God and man. Thirdly, The lively sacrifice of the Church is in the mass propitiatory as well for the quick as the dead.' Everywhere you will observe the order is the same. The real, true, substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements, is the prominent point. IT WAS NOT SO MUCH AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION AS AGAINST THE CORPORAL PRESENCE, THAT THE SAINTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION PROTESTED TO THE DEATH." (Pages 13, 14.)

"'No,' quoth he, 'you must believe A REAL PRESENCE *in the sacrament.*'

"'In the Sacrament?' quoth I. 'No, I will not shut Him up, nor *tie Him to it*, otherwise than *faith seeth* and permitteth. If I should *include Christ's* REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, or *tie Him to it* otherwise than to THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, then THE WICKED MAN SHOULD RECEIVE HIM; which I DO NOT, nor WILL NOT believe by God's grace.'" (Ibid. pp. 510, 511.)

IV.

"'The wicked,' saith Master Harpsfield, 'do receive the VERY BODY OF CHRIST, but NOT THE GRACE *of His body*.'

"'No,' quoth I, '*they receive* NOT THE BODY; for Christ's body is no dead carcass: *he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit*, which is not without grace, I ween.'" (Ibid. p. 512.)

V.

[1] "Here Master Pendleton was something abashed, as appeareth by his fumbling in his speech.

"'Master Bradford,' quod he, 'I do not know wherefor you are condemned.'

"'Marry,' quod I, '*transubstantiation is the thing whereof I am condemned*, and also *the denial of* WICKED MEN TO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.'" (Ibid. p. 542.)

VI.

[2] "'You deny *the presence*,' quoth my lord of York.

"'I do *not*,' quoth I, 'to *the faith of the worthy receiver*.'

"'Why,' quoth he, 'what is that than to say that Christ LIETH NOT ON THE ALTAR?'

"'No, my lord,' quoth I, 'indeed I BELIEVE NOT SUCH A PRESENCE.'" (Ibid. p. 522.)

VII.

[3] "Cui Articulo ipse Bradford respondendo dixit, That Christ is present in the sacrament when the sacrament is duly ministered and that Christ is present in the sacrament by faith, to faith, and in faith, and none otherwise; and saith that Christ is not in the sacrament by transubstantiation; and saith that

[1] This is from the Conference with Pendleton, March 28, 1555.
[2] This from Conference with Health and Day, Feb. 22, 1555.
[3] This is from Bradford's sentence.

simply he believeth no transubstantiation; also that it is not the body of Christ but to him that receiveth it; and that an evil man doth not receive it *in formâ panis;* and that after and before the receipt there is the substance of bread." (Ibid. p. 585.)

VIII.

"The sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the world was not simply 'His body and His blood,' but 'His body broken and His blood shed'; that is, all His passion and suffering in His body and flesh. In that therefore they offer, as they say, the same sacrifice which Christ offered, dearly beloved, do they not, as much as in them is . . . crucify Christ again? . . .

"Whereas they call this sacrifice of the mass, the principal mean to apply the benefit of Christ's death to the quick and dead, I would gladly have them to show, where and of whom they learned it. Sure I am, they learned it not of Christ, for when He sent His disciples abroad to apply unto men the benefit of His death, He bade them not mass it, but preach the Gospel, as the mean by the which God had appointed believers to be saved." (Letters and Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 287.)

HOOPER.

John Hooper (or Hoper, or Houper) was born about the close of the fifteenth century. He was educated at Oxford, and embraced the monastic life. After the dissolution of the monasteries was kindly received at Zurich by Bullinger. In 1548 he returned to England and was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester in 1550. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Fleet, in Sept., 1553. He was condemned in Jan., 1555, taken to Gloucester, and burnt near to his own cathedral. Foxe says "Tunstall asked him to say 'whether he believed the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, and Master Hooper said plainly that there was none such, neither did he believe any such thing.' Whereupon they bade the notaries write that he was married and would not go from his wife, and that he believed not the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament: therefore he was worthy to be deprived of his bishopric."

The first Extract is from "A brief and clear Confession of the Christian faith," first published in 1550.

I.

"I believe that *all this Sacrament consisteth* in *the use thereof;* so that without the *right use* the bread and wine *in nothing differ* from other common bread and wine that is commonly used; and therefore I do *not believe* that the *body*

of Christ can be *contained, hid, or enclosed* in the bread, *under the bread*, or *with the bread ;* neither the blood *in the wine, under the wine, or with the wine.* But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven on the right hand of the Father (as before we have said) ; and that always and as often as we *use this bread and wine* according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, *we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood.*

" I believe that this receiving is not done *carnally or bodily*, but *spiritually*, through a *true and lively faith ;* that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not *given* to the *mouth and belly* for the nourishing of the body, but *unto* OUR FAITH for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man unto eternal life. And for that cause we have *no need that Christ should come from heaven to us, but that we should ascend unto Him*, lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption ; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements.

" I believe that this Holy Supper is a Sacrament of faith unto *the faithful only*, and not for the infidels : wherein a man findeth and receiveth no more than he bringeth with him, saving peradventure the increase of faith, grace and virtue. And therefore they only find and receive Jesus Christ unto salvation, which through true and lively faith bring the same with them : but the others find and *receive* ONLY THE OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGNS, and that to their condemnation, as Judas and other such-like wicked and reprobate." (Later Writings, P. S. Edit., p. 49.)

II.

" Which sacrament is not a bare sign and token of His death only, as many men imagine, as the picture of Hercles is Hercles, or the image of Jupiter to be Jupiter : but I put as much difference between the sacraments of Christ, and all other signs and tokens not appointed for sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince, that is annexed unto the writing or charter that containeth all the prince's right and title that he hath unto his realm, and the king's arms painted in a glass window. Such seals, annexed unto so weighty writings, be no less esteemed than the whole right, title, or claim that is confirmed by the seal, though the matter of the seal be nothing but wax, not for

the value of the matter, (for twopence will buy ten times as much wax,) but for the use that the matter is appointed unto. And he that would take upon him to deny the king's seal in such a purpose, and say, it is but a piece of wax, it were no less than treason, and a very contempt of the king himself; because the king hath appointed that seal to be *honourably received and reverently used of all men.* And as the writings sealed doth confirm and declare the right of the owner unto all the world; so doth the sacraments confirm the assurance of everlasting life unto the faithfuls, and declareth the same to all the world. And as the matter, substance, and land itself is *not corporally nor really contained* in the writing, nor *annexed to the writing*, neither *brought* (when any matter of controversy is for the land) before the judge *with the writing; no more is the* CORPORAL BODY OF CHRIST *brought before the Church*, NEQUE CUM PANE, NEQUE IN PANE, NEQUE SUB PANE, NEQUE PER PANEM, NEQUE ANTE PANEM, NEQUE POST PANEM.

"But when the minister delivereth unto me the thing that is in his power to deliver, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost *delivereth unto my faith*, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF MY SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST *spiritually, and not corporally.* So doth *the merits of this precious body* in *heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth;* and *no contradiction or impossibility for Christ's body so to do.* It may be in heaven, and yet *extend* HIS VIRTUE by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul, *by the means of faith*, which at the time of the receiving of this sacrament is in my soul, and out of my soul; as the Spirit of God is in every godly heart, and out of the heart in heaven with God: so was God, at the creation of man unto His own likeness, in man and out of man. Yet to make it more plain, as the sun in heaven doth extend down his beams and lighten the earth, so doth Christ's body by faith, in spirit, expulse all darkness and sin out of the heart; moveth not bodily, but is everywhere, where faith is, spiritually, and at one time." (Early Writings, P. S. Edit., pp. 190-192.)

III.

"And unto the Holy Supper of the Lord they attribute a distribution, deliverance, or exhibition of Christ's natural body; whereas it is but a confirmation of the grace and mercy, that

He bought for us upon the cross with shedding His precious blood, and death of His innocent body: as the words sheweth plainly (Luke xxii.; 1 Cor. xi.); where Christ saith, He did not institute His last Supper that men should *bodily eat His body*, but that they should do always the same *in the remembrance of His death, and consider the grace that He obtained for us in His body and blood*, and be thankful for the same." (Ibid. p. 399.)

IV.

"Verba autem mutationis panis et vini ac præsentiæ corporis Christi in cœna Domini, immo verbum sacrificandi et sacrificii, scimus frequenter esse apud patres. Sed ipsi hæc vocabula usurpant eo modo et sensu quo ecclesia Christi ab ejus ascensione usurpavit, et nos nunc usurpamus: hoc est, panem et vinum in sacra cœna mutari quidem, sed in usu, non in substantia; Christum vero corpore suo adesse, sed spiritualiter et sacramentaliter contemplatione fidei recte utentium sacra cœna Domini, quoad corporis ejus gratiam, sed non quoad corporis ejus substantiam. Cœna Domini (quod impia missa non est) etiam sacrificium Christianorum vocatur, non re ipsa, sed nominis communicatione et participatione; quia recordatio et memoria sit veri sacrificii Christi semel in cruce oblati. Qualis autem injuria et tyrannis est hæc, non permittere ut sancti patres sua ipsorum verba interpretentur!" (Later Writings, p. 394.)

V.

"Nos igitur perspicuitatem et lucem verbi divini assequentes Christum (*quod ad carnem ejus attinet*) mundum RELIQUISSE docemus et credimus; Spiritu tamen suo tam bonos quam malos sustentare; hos quidem, ut pie vivant; illos autem, ut impie vivere desistant. Et in sacra actione cœnæ suæ mysticæ PIIS ita semper *adest*, ut illis *seipsum totum tum corpore tum anima communicet;* non ut in CORPUS PER OS *descendat*, sed ut *in animam* PER FIDEM sese infundat, ejusque vi et virtute cum corpus tum anima pie recipientis sacramentum sanctificentur ad vitam æternam; modo non secundum carnem, sed secundum Spiritum, qui se Christo sacramentis obstrinxere vivant et ambulent." (Ibid. p. 453.)

VI.

"Si quis cupit hâc de re plura cognoscere, *quod* MALI NON COMEDANT *corpus Christi*, legat Cyprianum in Sermone De

Cœna Domini, Augustinum De verbis Domini, Sermone xxxiii, tractatu in Joannem xxvi, Hieronymum in Esaiam cap. lxvi., libro iv., in Hieremiam, cap. xxii. Et dicere etiam quod canes et mures, si externum signum sacramenti acciperint, quod una cum externo signo significatum (hoc est, corpus et sanguinem Christi,) recipiant (ut dixi,) plane impium est. Panis angelorum factus est munificentia Dei panis et cibus *piorum hominum*, sed *non impiorum*, nec canum nec murum: nec a Deo Patre in mundum Christus erat missus, ut impios, canes, et mures pasceret; sed ut peccatores ad pœnitentiam converteret, et pœnitentes corporis et sanguinis sui meritis adimpleret. Quod autem neoterici dicunt, quod *impii cum sacris signis corporis et sanguinis Christi signata* (*hoc est, ipsum corpus et sanguinem Christi,*) *accipiant*, sed indigne, et ad judicium et condemnationem, NON ADMITTIMUS; propterea quod de suo scrinio et pectore loquuntur, et *non ex verbo Dei.* Paulus enim clare testatur, quod qui panem signum indigne accipiunt judicium manducent. Hæc sunt illius verba: 'Itaque quisquis ederit panem hunc, aut biberit de poculo Domini, indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini.' Non dicit Paulus, Itaque quisquis ederit *corpus Domini* et biberit *sanguinem Domini indigne*: sed quia *indigne sumentes sacramenta* corporis et sanguinis Christi signis cælestibus contumeliam faciunt, ea contumelia signorum rebus signatis imputatur, ut Paulus dicit; ita ut sint corporis et sanguinis Christi rei: ut Israelitarum, Judæ, ac Simonis Magi exempla testantur; qui externa signa, manna in deserto, sacrum panem in cœna Domini, externamque lotionem baptismatis receperunt, quos tamen Christus non approbavit." (Ibid. pp. 497-8.)

VII.

"The Count Palatine has lately provided for the preaching of the Gospel throughout his dominions; but as far as relates to the Eucharist he has descended, as the proverb has it, from the horse to the ass; for he has fallen from popery into the doctrine of Luther, who is in that particular more erroneous than all the papists; and those who deny the substance of bread to remain in the sacrament, and substitute the body of Christ in its place, come more closely to the truth than those who affirm that the natural Body of Christ is with the bread, in the bread, and under the form of bread, and yet occupies no place." (Letter to Bullinger in Original Letters, P. S. Edit., i., pp. 37-8.)

Hutchinson.

Roger Hutchinson was educated at Cambridge, where he was admitted Fellow of St. John's, 1543. He died a natural death in 1555 or 1556.

The quotations are mostly taken from "The Image of God, or Laymen's Book," first published in 1550, with a dedicatory Epistle to Archbishop Cranmer.

I.

"You will ask me then, whether we receive Christ's body? *Yea, truly*, from heaven, from the right hand of the Father; *not out of the bread nor in the bread.* For, unless we eat His flesh, and drink His blood, we shall not dwell in Him; we shall not arise at the last day; we shall not have eternal life. Christ's humanity is the mean whereby we must obtain all things; the way by which we must climb up to heaven." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 35.)

II.

"But peradventure the papists will reply, If it be meat, then is it received both of good and evil men; for neither of both sorts can live without meat. To this I answer, it is the meat of the soul, not of the body; the food of the spirit, not of the flesh; and therefore it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL PERSONS, because the *meat is good*, and *they be evil.* So that this is a strong argument; Christ's flesh and blood is meat; *ergo* it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL MEN." (Ibid. p. 42.)

III.

"To eat Christ's flesh and to drink His blood, is *to believe* that the Son of God concerning His humanity and flesh, was *nailed on the Cross, and that His blood was let forth for the expiation of our sins*, and for our redemption and righteousness, and to repose us again into God's favour. And this spiritual receipt, which is *by faith, is so effectual*, and of so mighty and so vehement an operation, that, as matrimony maketh man and wife one flesh according as it is written, *erunt duo in carne una*, so it joineth us unto Christ *reipsa*, that is, *really, truly, and effectually*, making us flesh of His flesh, and bones of His bones, as Paul witnesseth; that is, lively, holy, and very members of His mystical body. . . . God's *holy Word knoweth*

NO OTHER RECEIPT OF CHRIST'S VERY BODY and natural flesh, neither *in the sacrament or without it.*" (Ibid. pp. 262, 263.)

IV.

"Throughout the Scriptures this word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood; for *they* do *sanctify* their receivers. St. Austin also denieth this distinction, writing thus: 'He that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt he eateth not Christ's flesh nor drinketh not His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing unto his damnation.'" (Ibid. p. 264.)

V.

"And Prosper, in his Book of Sentences, saith of such unworthy receivers, that though every day indifferently they do receive, that they eat the sacrament and figure of so great a thing unto the condemnation of their presumption, and NOT CHRIST'S BODY. Bede also hath the very same words. And the famous and learned father St. Hierome doth confirm this to be a true doctrine, writing upon the sixty-sixth chapter of the prophet Esay, 'As long,' saith this elder and godly father of Christ's Church, 'as long as they be not holy and clean in body and in spirit, they do not eat the flesh of Jesu, nor taste of His blood.' Of these it is evident that, as the sensible sacrament is received unworthily of ungodly men unto condemnation; so THE BODY OF CHRIST, which is the bread of life, is ONLY RECEIVED WORTHILY and OF GOOD MEN, *always unto salvation*, expiation, and righteousness, and of no man unto destruction, death, and damnation, whosoever is partaker of it; as St. Austin saith in his sermon of the holy feast of passover. Therefore, if we say *that ungodly men do eat Christ's flesh*, we deny the doctrine of all the elder fathers; we deny Christ to be the bread of life; we deny Him to be our righteousness, our saving health, our expiation, our ransom, our sanctification and holiness; who will not fail to deny us likewise before His Father, unless we renounce this devilish error." (Ibid. p. 265.)

VI.

"That the Lord's Supper, which men call the mass, is not a sacrifice for sin, St. Paul declareth plainly, saying: *Sine sanguinis effusione*, etc., 'that without shedding of blood no

sacrifice can blot out sin.' If Christ be sacrificed or offered in His Supper, for the expiation of sin, His precious and most comfortable blood is shed again, is poured forth again: for without bloodshed is no remission." (Ibid. p. 48.)

VII.

"Wherefore the Supper of the Lord is no *sacrifice* for sin, forasmuch as it is a *sacrament*. Mark this difference, brethren, and be no longer deceived. The parable of the thieves teacheth us, that Christ's coming hath disannulled all such priesthood as is called *sacerdotium;* but *presbyterium* remaineth. The priests and Levites pass by, and leave the wounded man, which was robbed going from Hierusalem to Jericho, unholpen, unprovided for." (Ibid. p. 49.)

VIII.

"Moreover, mark what I say unto thee. Read over all the New Testament, and thou shalt not find once this word, *sacerdos*, 'priest,' applied or spoken of any one sort of ministers (as the common sort do use it), but when it is referred to the Pharisees, and to such as do appertain without all doubt to the Old Testament. It is referred always to all Christian people, which all be *sacerdotes* through Christ: and ministers have *no manner of sacrifice*, but common with the laity, both men and women; that is to say, the *sacrifice of thanksgiving*, and the quick and lively *oblation of their own bodies*. The New Testament requireth *no other sacrifice*." (Ibid. p. 50.)

IX.

"Moreover, as Christ did not ordain His Supper to be received privately for benefactors either dead or alive, or for others, no more did He *elevate* and lift up the sacrament over His head, to be *seen and worshipped* of His disciples. He gave it them into their hands *to eat*, and not *to honour it;* to *receive* it, and *not to worship* it with holding up of their hands and knocks on their breasts. ONLY GOD is to honoured with this kind of reverence, and NO SACRAMENT; for *God is not a sacrament, neither is the sacrament God*." (Ibid. p. 230.)

We have thus had before us extracts from the writings of our Reformers of King Edward's reign.

None, I imagine, who have read these extracts with any

degree of care, will hesitate for a moment in acknowledging the distinct and strong repugnance of all the writers to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

In the case of Ridley, indeed, it is, perhaps, scarcely to be wondered at that some of his expressions have been thought to look the other way, and have been eagerly fastened on by those who would fain find shelter for their teaching under so great a name. But other extracts which have been before us leave no room whatever to question what Ridley's views really were. And his own interpretations and explanations of his own expressions afford a good key for the unlocking of difficulties, such as sometimes, perhaps, may be felt in the writings of other Reformers, whose language might otherwise seem to imply either some confusion of mind, or some inconsistency of views.

The truth is that the words "sacrament," "sacramental," "sacramentally," are used in one sense by our Reformers, in quite another sense by our and their opponents.

The word "sacrament" indeed is used by Cranmer and others (as in our Catechism) sometimes as including the inward and spiritual grace, and the whole administration.[1] But more commonly, in the use of our Reformers, (as again in our Catechism also), it stands for *merely* the outward and visible signs in the Lord's Supper, for the elements of bread and wine.

And since to the sacraments (the visible signs) are given the names of the things they signify (according to the usage of the Fathers), the things signified are said (in the language of our Reformers) to be *sacramentally present* wherever their signs are present and *sacramentally received*, whenever the signs (which bear their names) are received. In such language the words "sacramentally present" or "present in a sacrament," indicate nothing more than the presence of the sacrament or outward sign, and the word "sacramentally received" would tell only of the reception of the visible element. To say that the blood is present in the cup "*sacramentally*," or "*in a sacrament*" or "*by way of a sacrament*," is equivalent to saying that the sacrament of the blood (*i.e.* the wine which signifies Christ's blood) is there. So after Ridley had declared that "the cup *is called the blood* (*i.e.* by Chrysostom) because it is *the sacrament of the blood*," he will not allow Curtop to fasten on that which is in the chalice the name of *blood*, in any other sense (in the sense of "the Real Presence") by distinguishing

[1] See Cranmer's Preface to "The Lord's Supper." Edit. of 1551.

between the *sacrament* of the blood and the *blood*, but he maintains "The sacrament of the blood *is* the blood, (*i.e.* in the language of Chrysostom) and that is attributed to the sacrament, (*i.e.* of course by Chrysostom) which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament."

Thus it will be seen that the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally" exclude the sense of "real" and "really," and are indeed distinctly opposed to them.[1] Quite as much

[1] "Therefore, the bread *is called Christ's body* after consecration, as St. Ambrose saith, and yet it is NOT SO REALLY, but *sacramentally*." (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., p. 180.) "As Christ's body is called bread, although *indeed it be not bread:* so the *sacramental bread* is called Christ's body, although *indeed* it be *not Christ's body* . . . even so, according to the saying of Ignatius, it is the flesh of Christ . . . that is to say, a *sacrament* of that flesh. . . . Thus they borrow each of them the other's name, because they are joined together in one mystery. . . . If any man think it strange that the sacrament *is called* the body and the flesh of Christ, being *not so indeed*, let him understand that the written word of God is likewise called Christ's body and Christ's flesh. . . So saith St. Hierome." (Jewel, "Sermon and Harding," pp. 518, 519.) "There be three manner of eatings, one spiritual only, another spiritual and sacramental both together, and the third *sacramental* only: and yet *Christ Himself* is eaten but in the *first two* manner of ways, as you truly teach. And for to set out this distinction somewhat more plainly, that plain men may understand it, it may thus be termed: that there is a spiritual eating only, when Christ by a true faith is eaten without the sacrament; also there is another eating both spiritual and *sacramental*, when the visible *sacrament* is eaten with the mouth, and Christ Himself is eaten with a true faith: the third eating is *sacramentally* only, when *the sacrament is eaten, and not Christ Himself.* So that in the first is Christ eaten without the sacrament; in the second He is eaten with the sacrament; and in the third is the *sacrament* eaten *without Him;* and therefore it is called *sacramental eating* only, because *only the sacrament* is eaten, and *not Christ Himself.*" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," p. 205.) This agrees exactly with what Ridley says, "Evil men do eat the very true and natural Body of Christ *sacramentally* and *no further*," which he explains after, "It is the body to them, that is, the *sacrament of the body*," pp. 246, 247. So Cranmer again, "The evil [eat] ONLY *sacramentally*, that is to say *figuratively*. And therefore hath St. Augustine these words *certo quodam modo*, 'after a certain manner,' because that the evil eat the *sacrament*, which after a certain manner is called the very body of Christ." ("On Lord's Supper," pp. 224-5.) "Although St. Augustine . . . call the sacrament of Christ's body and blood His body and blood, yet is the *sacrament* NO MORE but the *sacrament thereof*, and yet it is *called* the body and blood of Christ, as 'sacraments have the names of the things whereof they be sacraments;' as the same St. Augustine teacheth most plainly." (Ibid. p. 224.) Again, "A figure hath the name of the thing that is signified thereby. As a man's image is called a man, a lion's image a lion, etc., etc., . . . so a thousand like speeches . . . not understand of the *very* things, but only of the *images* of them." (Ibid. pp. 225, 226.) "He [Christ] is not in it [the bread], neither spiritually, as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven, but ONLY *sacramentally*, as a thing may be said to be *in the figure* whereby it is signified." (Ibid. p. 238.) "It is the same body which was born of the Virgin, was crucified, ascended; but *tropically*, and by *a figure.* And so I say *Panis est corpus*, is a figurative speech, speaking *sacramentally;* for it is a sacrament of His body." (Cranmer's Disputation at Oxford, P. S. Edit., pp. 400, 401.) "All these things do convince their error, which interpret *sacramental* speeches as *proper*, and reject figures and tropes, especially in the institution of the Supper." (Bullinger's Decades, v., pp. 40, 289.) "Undoubtedly their meaning is, that we should speak of the sacraments sacramentally, and that

as the phrases "representative presence" and "figurative presence" would be inconsistent with *actual* presence, and the phrases "representatively present," and "figuratively present," and "present by representation," and "present in a figure," and "present in a picture," would necessarily imply *actual absence;* quite so much in the language of our Reformers (who in this matter, believed at least, that they were following the example of the ancient Fathers) would the phrases "sacramental presence," "sacramentally present," "present in a sacrament," "present by way of a sacrament," "symbolically present," "present in mystery," and the like, necessarily EXCLUDE *the* REAL *presence* of the things signified by the present sacraments or outward signs. This is the more carefully to be observed, because in the language of the Church of Rome, as well as in that of those who now maintain the doctrine of "the Real Objective Presence," the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally," include the idea of intense *reality*[1] of Presence, however that Presence may be regarded as supernatural and ineffable. And thus if the distinction of meanings be not carefully observed, we may be apt to fall into great con-

sacramental speeches ought to be expounded *sacramentally.*" (Ibid. p. 451.) "If thou yet marvel, how the unbelievers can be guilty of the Lord's body and blood, being eaten but *sacramentally;* learn this out of other places." (Ibid. p. 466.) "They understood, that the Lord's bread, given unto them by the Lord, is a *remembrance* of His body . . . for all *sacramental* speeches were to the holy fathers very well known." (Ibid. p. 442.) "Augustin doth not feign, that Christ hath two bodies; but he meaneth, that the human body bare in his hands the *sacramental* body, that is to say, the bread which is in the *sacrament* of the true body." (Ibid. p. 438.) "It is a *sacramental* speech, which truly everybody at that time understood; as also at this day it is no new nor hard kind of speaking to say, that in the seal there is faith and truth, in a marriage-ring the faith and love of wedlock, in a sceptre and crown the king's authority." (Ibid. p. 310.) So Jeremy Taylor, "St. Austin opposes *sacramental* receiving to the *true* and *real*, and says that the wicked only receive it *sacramentally* but not the thing whose sacrament it is." (Vol. vi., p. 72.) It should be added, to avoid misunderstanding, that in this "*unreal*" signification of the words "sacramental," "sacramentally," and the like (as applied to the *presence*, etc., of the *thing signified*) there is nothing to imply any denial or forgetfulness of the *real* relation which the "*sign* or *sacrament*" bears to "*so great a thing*" as it not only signifies but *seals*, and sealing is the *real* communion of, by virtue of Christ's institution making the "*sacramentum*" to be "by grace," to all INTENTS AND PURPOSES, the "*res sacramenti*" to the FAITHFUL.

[1] "We say that the union is *sacramental;* not as if we meant by that term to signify, that it is, in any respect, less than, or different from reality. By *sacramental* we mean that it is unique, a union proper and peculiar to the sacrament, without example and without parallel, except in the great fact of the Incarnation." ("Tracts for the Day," v., p. 32.) "The Presence, of which our Lord speaks, has been termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, as opppsed *not* to what is real, but to what is natural." (Pusey's Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," p. 21, compare Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., ch. i., and see "Goode on Eucharist," i., pp. 160-1, and Suppl. 19, 20.)

fusion, and may easily be led to play with quotations at cross purposes.[1]

The next paper will be taken up with extracts from our Reforming Divines of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

[1] In no other way is it possible (I think) to account for such a use of the authority of our Reformers and of the words of Ridley as the following: "It is well to remember that the leading English Reformers did not deny the *Reality* of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Eucharist, but only contended that this Presence was supernatural *and sacramental*. Thus Ridley, when examined at Oxford as to his faith, six months before he was put to death, says, 'It is His True BLOOD which is in the Chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of CHRIST . . . but *by way of a Sacrament*.'" (Machonochie's Address, Jan., 1867, p. 5.) In no other way, also, does it seem possible to account for Mr. Grueber's marginal notes to his citations from Ridley in "Reply to Dr. Heurtley," pp. 6, 7.

No. III.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS: REFORMING DIVINES OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

In this Paper no attempt is made to classify the writers. It contains extracts from the writings of our Reforming Divines in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, their names following one another in alphabetical order.

Becon.

Thomas Becon, born 1511 or 1512, was educated at Cambridge, where he was a diligent hearer of Latimer. He was ordained about 1538. Under the Act of the Six Articles, "he was compelled, besides suffering, it would seem, some imprisonment, to make a public submission." On the accession of Edward, he became Rector of St. Stephen Walbrook, and was made by Cranmer one of the six preachers of Canterbury Cathedral. Subsequently he became Chaplain to the Duke of Somerset. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Tower as a seditious preacher, with Bradford and Veron. Being released he retired to Strassburg. On the death of Mary he returned to England, and in the Convocation of 1562 voted in favour of the six propositions for the omission of some ceremonies. The propositions were rejected by a majority of one. He was a friend of Archbishop Parker, and sincerely attached to the Church of England. He died about 1570.

The following extracts are taken from "The Catechism set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son."

It has a Preface addressed to Becon's children, concluding thus, "Take it, therefore, with joyful hearts, as a testimony of your father's goodwill toward you; yea, receive it as your patrimony. . . . And I shall most humbly beseech God to be your father and defender, and to give you His Holy Spirit, which may govern you in all your doings, that ye may walk blameless in His sight, and be found in the number of God's elect."

I.

Father:—"Why, is not the very natural body of Christ eaten of the communicants both faithful and unfaithful at the Lord's Supper?"

Son:—"Christ is ONLY *received and eaten of the* FAITHFUL *communicants;* the unfaithful *receive* NOT *the Body and Blood of Christ*, but the *sacraments of the same* ONLY, yea, and that unto their damnation."

Father:—"And is Christ received *corporally* with the *corporal mouth* of the faithful communicants?"

Son:—"The natural Body of Christ is *only in heaven;* and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant with her mouth, that is to say, *with* FAITH, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort, and feeleth no less true refection than the body doth by receiving corporal food; yea, the faithful communicant, thus eating and receiving Christ, receiveth both in body and soul an heavenly nourishment, a singular comfort, and an unoutspeakable joy."

Father:—"Faith then is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten."

Son:—"Yea, verily, as Christ saith: 'I am that bread of life. He that cometh unto me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." (Catechism, etc., P. S. Edit., p. 295.)

II.

Father:—"What shall we then say to the ancient Fathers of Christ's Church, which in many places call the Supper of the Lord a sacrifice?"

Son:—"'Even as images are wont to be called, (as St. Austin saith,) by the names of those things whereof they are images, as when we behold a table or wall painted we say, that is Cicero, that is Sallustius;' so likewise, forasmuch as the celebration of the Lord's Supper is a certain representative image of the passion of Christ, which is the alone true sacrifice, therefore, the holy Fathers many times call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice. Now, if the Lord's Supper be *not properly a sacrifice*, but only a *memorial of the true sacrifice*, which is the passion and death of Christ; how can the massing Papists brag that their Mass (in the which many things are done contrary to the institution of Christ) is a propitiatory, satisfactory, and

expiatory sacrifice for the sins of quick and of the dead?" (Ibid. p. 249.)

III.

Son:—"Our Saviour Christ did both institute this holy Supper at a table, and the apostles of Christ also did receive it at a table. And what can be more perfect than that which Christ and his apostles have done? All the primitive Church also received the Supper of the Lord at a table. And St. Paul, speaking of the Lord's Supper, maketh mention not of an altar, but of a table, 'Ye cannot be partakers,' saith he, 'of the Lord's table, and of the Devil's table also.' Tables for the ministration of the Lord's Supper continued in the Church of Christ almost three hundred years after Christ universally, and in some places longer, as histories make mention; so that the use of altars is but a new invention, and brought in, as some write, by Pope Sixtus, the second of that name.

"Moreover, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice. And altars in the old law were built and set up at the commandment of God to offer sacrifice upon them. But *all those sacrifices do now cease*, (for they were but shadows of good things to come,) therefore the *altars ought to cease* with them. Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus: 'We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle.'" (Ibid. p. 297.)

IV.

"Of these words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ it is manifest, plain, and evident, that the virtue and power of His flesh and blood is so great and mighty, that whosoever eateth and drinketh thereof shall live for ever, and have everlasting life. But the wicked and *unfaithful*, although they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, have not everlasting life, as we have Judas for an example: therefore it followeth, that *the wicked and* UNFAITHFUL *do* NOT *eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ.*

"Again Christ saith: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' But the wicked and unfaithful dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them; therefore the *wicked and* UNFAITHFUL *neither eat nor drink the body and*

blood of Christ, although they daily receive the *sacraments* and *signs* of them, as St. Augustine saith." (Ibid. p. 292.)

V.

"THIS IS *to eat that bread of life*, even to *believe in Christ*, that is to say, by love to be incorporate in Him. Therefore, forasmuch as the reprobate hath not believed in Him, he *hath not eaten Him;* and so he had not the faith of the Christians, whereby alone sins are released."

Father:—"These words are very plain, and cannot justly be denied; of the which we learn truly, that *not the* UNFAITHFUL, but the faithful, *not the wicked*, but the godly disposed *only*, *eat and drink of the body and blood of Christ.* Notwithstanding, I would also in this behalf gladly hear the judgment of the ancient Fathers and old writers, that we may be well assured, even by their testimonies also, that this is no new doctrine, to teach that the godly only eat Christ, and not the wicked; the faithful, and not the unfaithful; the members of Christ, and not the members of Satan." (Ibid. p. 292.)

VI.

"All these testimonies of the ancient writers, diligently considered, declare manifestly that NOT *wicked and* UNFAITHFUL, but the godly and *faithful* persons *only* eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. The ungodly eat the sacrament; but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the sacrament, as St. Augustine writeth of Judas: 'The apostles,' saith he, 'did eat bread, that was the Lord; but Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord.' For whosoever eateth Christ liveth for ever, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him, is incorporated and made all one with Christ, is made a member of Christ's body, is sanctified and made holy, is made clean both in body and soul, dieth not the death of a sinner, hath remission of his sins, obtaineth immortality, escheweth all evils of death, and for ever liveth with Christ. But none of all these things chance to the unfaithful and wicked persons; therefore eat they not the body of Christ, nor yet drink His blood." (Ibid. p. 294.)

VII.

"Finally, who knoweth not that we come unto the Lord's table, not to offer bloody sacrifices, to the performance whereof

we had need of altars, but to eat and drink and spiritually to feed upon Him, that was once crucified and offered up for us on the altar of the cross, a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God the Father, yea, and that once for all? Now if we come together to eat and drink these holy mysteries, and so spiritually to eat Christ's body, and to drink His blood, unto salvation both of our bodies and souls, who seeth not that a table is more meet for the celebration of the Lord's Supper than an altar?" (Ibid p. 298.)

VIII.

"He said not, Behold, fall down and worship. The worshipping therefore of the sacrament ought utterly to be forbidden and to be abolished, as mere idolatry and most execrable abomination before the Lord our God, to whom alone all worship, honour, and glory is due." (Ibid. p. 301.)

BILSON.

One of the most eminent and learned prelates of Elizabeth's reign was Thomas Bilson, born 1536; Bishop of Worcester, 1596; Bishop of Winchester, 1597 to 1616; who, among various other learned works, published in 1585, when he was Warden of Winchester, one entitled, "The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," to which was added a Dedicatory Epistle to the Queen.

From this work (one sentence of which has been frequently quoted to prove that Bishop Bilson maintained the objective view of the Presence—see "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 789), the following extracts are made. He took a prominent part in the Hampton Court Conference. Died 1616.

I.

"But the wicked, notwithstanding the corporal chamming of this sacrament, die the death of sinners; *ergo, they neither eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink His blood;* not because their teeth or jaws fail them, but by reason they want faith, which is *the right and proper instrument of spiritual eating.*

"Since, then, man 'believeth with his heart unto righteousness' (Romans x.), as Paul teacheth, not with his jaws nor lips; *ergo, the soul of man which* ONLY *believeth,* ONLY *doth eat the flesh of Christ;* and our bodies, which have no means to believe, can neither eat nor drink in that sort and sense that our Saviour there speaketh of.

"*The wicked live not by Christ, neither abide in Christ, and therefore by the very determination of the Lord Himself, they neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood.* Run now to your distinction of corporal and spiritual eating when you will, but so long as these words stand written in the Gospel, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me,' the godly will soon conclude, THAT SUCH AS LIVE NOT BY CHRIST, DO NOT EAT CHRIST: [his own capitals:] and so that corporal eating of Christ's flesh, which you would erect, common to the faithful and faithless, to be no kind of eating at all, notwithstanding they receive the material and external elements of this mystery." (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 790).

II.

"The sacraments are carnally pressed with teeth, which they [*i.e.*, the wicked] are partakers of as well as the godly; but *Christ Himself is not eaten with teeth;* and therefore *the wicked, wanting both spirit and faith by which He is received, cannot possibly eat His flesh, or drink His blood, though they come to His table never so often.*" (Ibid. p. 791.)

III.

"The signs which are called after consecration by the names Christ's body and blood, do enter our mouths, and pass our throats; the true flesh and blood of Christ do not, but are eaten at the Lord's table only of the inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there, where He delighteth, and not in the mouths and jaws of men, which is no place for Him THAT SITTETH IN HEAVEN, WHITHER WE MUST FLY WITH THE SPIRITUAL WINGS OF OUR SOULS AND SPIRITS BEFORE WE CAN BE PARTAKERS OF HIM." (Ibid. p. 791.)

IV.

"I trust the godly will be fully resolved, that the manner of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, which the Lord Himself first proposed in the sixth of John, was *not literal nor corporal*, as the Capernites understood Him and were deceived, but *allegorical and spiritual. Allegorical* in respect of the words which be not there precisely taken in their usual signification for grinding with the teeth, and straining down the throat, but *figuratively spoken*, and import as much as *con-*

fessing and embracing with heart and inward affection. Spiritual, because not our mouths, but our minds—not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh and blood of Christ, and that not by chewing or swallowing, but BY REMEMBERING AND BELIEVING THAT HIS BODY WAS WOUNDED, AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR OUR PERFECT AND ETERNAL REDEMPTION." (Ibid. p. 795.)

V.

"As we doubt not that Christ is always present on His table *in truth, grace, virtue, and effect, if we open the eyes of our faith to behold Him, and mouth of our spirits to receive Him,* so the local and corporal hiding of His human substance under the shews of bread and wine was never taught by any Catholic Father or Council." (Ibid. p. 801.)

VI.

"By these things we have Him in this world, NOT REALLY, locally, or corporally, but truly, comfortably, and effectually, so as our bodies, souls, and spirits be sanctified and preserved by Him against the day of redemption." (Ibid. p. 800.)

VII.

"[The Fathers] taught Christ to be present *not in flesh but in grace; not in real and corporal existence, but in spiritual and fruitful efficience.* They prepared for Him not their jaws and bellies, but their minds and hearts." (Ibid. pp. 801, 802.)

VIII.

"*For as that part of man, which eateth the flesh of Christ, everteth your real presence,* because no local or corporal substance can enter or feed the soul, and the truth of Christ's flesh in this mystery by the general consent of all ages and churches doth enter and feed the soul; SO THE PLACE WHITHER WE MUST ASCEND BEFORE WE CAN EAT THE LORD'S FLESH DOTH CLEARLY CONFUTE THE SAME." (Ibid. p. 802.)

IX.

"Your *Real Presence* and ubiquity, if you will have Christ's human substance dispersed in many places, *without shape or*

circumscription, are THE VERY BOWELS AND INWARDS OF EUTYCHES' HERESY." (Ibid. p. 803.)

X.

Phi (Romanist):—"I see you mistake us. You think we adore the forms of bread and wine, when indeed we do not, but rather we adore Christ the Son the living God, and second Person in the Trinity in those mysteries, as St. Ambrose saith, or *as we speak more usually, under those forms of bread and wine.*"

Theo:—I mistake you not. I know you adore that which is locally and really *enclosed within the compass of your host and chalice, supposing it in matter and substance to be the glorious body of Christ;* but your foundation we say is false, and therefore your building must needs be ruinous. Christ is present in the mysteries, not by the material substance of His body *closed within the forms of bread and wine*, but *by a divine and spiritual virtue and efficience*, NOT MIXING HIS SUBSTANCE WITH THE ELEMENTS, BUT ENTERING THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL, and nourishing them with His spirit and grace to eternal life, the elements abiding in their proper and former essence and substance." (Ibid. pp. 805, 806.)

XI.

"Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice*. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving;* which is the *true* and *lively* sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's table, in respect of His *graces* and *mercies* there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must *eat*, and not sacrifice: but the *duties* which He requireth at our hands, when we approach His table, are *sacrifices*, not *sacraments*. As namely, to *offer* Him *thanks* and *praises*, *faith* and *obedience*, yea our *bodies* and *souls*, to be living, holy, and acceptable *sacrifices* unto Him, which is our *reasonable* service." (Quoted from Waterland, Works, v., p. 134.)

CALFHILL.

James Calfhill, or Calfield, born about 1530, educated at Oxford, was nominated to succeed Sandys as Bishop of Worcester when Sandys was removed to London; but he died before his consecration.

The following extract is taken from Calfhill's answer to John Martial, who had dedicated to Queen Elizabeth a Romish work, entitled, "A Treatise of the Cross."

"But where I attribute to Christian ministry so much as I spake of, there is no cause of pride for popish priests. For they swerve so far from Christ's institution, that they serve not at all for any godly purpose. Christ did ordain His apostles to preach; and to that end He breathed on them, shewing by that sign, the power and virtue of the Holy Ghost, wherewithal He endued them: but the Romish apes only retain the sign, the thing itself being farthest from them; and as for the end which Christ respected, they have least regard of. For they have taught their priests, that it is least part of their duty to preach; most to do sacrifice, and say Mass. . . . We know that Christ did offer Himself sufficiently; and made a perfect satisfaction for our sins. We know that He needeth not any priest's help to be as acceptable to His Father, for His service sake, as Christ for that one and only sacrifice of His body was. Christ gave commandment to be faithful ministers, not bloody conjurors. Christ gave an injunction to feed the flock, not to offer sacrifice. Christ hath promised His Holy Ghost, not to purge and take away sins, but to maintain the church, and keep it in good order. And as for the argument, that the most learned papists do build upon the Greek word, may easily be answered. For Chrysostom, when he had considered how Paul had written, that he was a minister of Jesus Christ, consecrating the Gospel; (for so St. Augustine turneth it,) that there might be an acceptable oblation and sacrifice of the Gentiles, saith: that the apostle there did make full mention of all the sacrifice that he could make; using both the terms of λειτουργία and ἱερουργία, whereupon the papists will ground their idolatrous Mass. This is my sacrifice, to preach the Gospel saith he: my sword is the Gospel; my sacrifice is the Gentiles." (Answer to Martiall, P. S. Edit., pp. 229, 230.)

Cooper.

Thomas Cooper, or Cowper, was made Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1540. In Mary's reign he practised as a physician in Oxford, but upon her death became a frequent preacher, and was several years Vice-chancellor of the University. In 1570 he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln; and in 1584 was translated to Winchester. He died April 29th, 1594.

The following quotations are taken from a publication entitled, "An Answer in Defence of the Faith." It was written

(1562) by Cooper in reply to an anonymous work, called "An Apology of Private Mass."

I.

"When we interpret Christ's words, we say it is a figurative speech, and such as the Holy Ghost often useth in the institution of sacraments and ceremonies, or in the describing of other mysteries. The figure is named Metonymia; when the name of the thing is given unto the sign. When these words therefore be laid unto us, 'This is My Body,' we say it is most true. But mystically, *sacramentally*, figuratively, *not* REALLY and according to the natural substance. For this interpretation we have a number of examples out of the Canonical Scriptures." ("Defence of the Truth," P. S. Edit., p. 199.)

II.

"For, sure I am, that neither the institution of Christ maketh mention of any oblation or sacrifice to be done by the minister, saving only the sacrifice of thanksgiving: nor yet the Scripture appointeth any bounden duty for the priest more to use the sacrament than other godly and well-disposed Christian men. . . . A sacrifice is a thing given to God: the sacrament was a thing given to us. Nothing therefore can be of nature more contrary than your sacrifice, and Christ's sacrament." (Ibid. pp. 87, 88.)

III.

"So much difference therefore as is between to give and to receive; to REMEMBER ONE *perfect sacrifice*, and daily to REITERATE a *sacrifice;* to celebrate in common as a testimony of unity, (and) to creep in corners or by-chapels as a sign of separation; so much difference is there between the *sacrament* by Christ's appointment, and the *sacrifice* of the Mass by you devised." (Ibid. p. 99.)

COVERDALE.

Miles Coverdale, born 1487, studied at Cambridge, entered the Augustinian order, aided Tyndale in the translation of the Bible, and by permission of Henry VIII. published his own translation in 1535. It was the first printed English Bible. Three years after, while at Paris preparing for another edition, he was cited before the Inquisition, and the copies printed were condemned to be burnt.

He returned to England, was made almoner to Queen Catherine Parr, and in 1551 Bishop of Exeter. In Queen Mary's reign he reached Geneva, contributing his aid to the Geneva Bible. He returned after Mary's death, and held for a short time a rectory in London. He died 1568.

The first extract is from a treatise, the plan of which was borrowed from Zuingle. It is said to have been first published at Marburg in 1540-47.

I.

"But *then eat we His flesh*, and *then drink we His blood*, when we through *true belief* do ponder and consider what He hath done and suffered for our sakes; *then are we partakers of His Supper and Feast*, when we for His sake do live, as He did for His Father's sake." ("Fruitful Lessons," P. S. Edit., p. 212.)

II.

"But let us look, wherefore they call it a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the Mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea, to be abhorred of all virtuous men! . . . But they will say, Christ is not so sacrificed in the Mass, that He dieth again upon the Cross; but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice that once was made. Why do they then call it a *sacrifice*, seeing it is but a *remembrance of a sacrifice?*" (Remains, pp. 470, 471.)

III.

"And when this perverse opinion was once received, it engendered many other superstitions. First, that carnal adoration, which is none other thing but mere idolatry. For if a man would prostrate himself before the bread, and honour Christ there, as if He were there present, contained therein, were not that the setting up of an idol instead of the sacrament? For we were not commanded to honour, but to eat."[1] ("Fruitful Lessons," p. 456.)

FULKE.

William Fulke, born sometime before 1538; educated at Cambridge, studied law for six years, was elected Fellow of St. John's

[1] This extract is from a treatise translated by Coverdale from Calvin.

College, Cambridge, 1564, was subsequently ejected on account of his intimacy with Cartwright. In 1571 he was presented to the rectory of Warley in Essex, and in 1573 to that of Dennington in Suffolk. Afterwards he accompanied the Earl of Lincoln as British Ambassador to Paris. In 1578 was made Master of Pembroke College. He died in 1589.

The first four extracts are taken from a work published in 1583, in defence "of the sincere and true translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue."

I.

"The word *priest*, by Popish abuse, is commonly taken for a sacrificer, the same that *sacerdos* in Latin. But the Holy Ghost never calleth the ministers of the word and sacraments of the New Testament ἱερεῖς or *sacerdotes*. Therefore the translators, to make a difference between the ministers of the Old Testament and them of the New, calleth the one, according to the usual acception, priests, and the other, according to the original derivation, elders. Which distinction seeing the vulgar Latin text doth always rightly observe, it is in favour of your heretical sacrificing priesthood, that you corruptly translate *sarcerdos* and *presbyter* always, as though they were all one, *a priest*, as though the Holy Ghost had made that distinction in vain, or that there were no difference between the priesthood of the New Testament and the Old. The name of priest, according to the original derivation from *presbyter*, we do not refuse: but according to the common acception for a *sacrificer*, we cannot take it, when it is spoken of the ministry of the New Testament." ("Defence of Translation," P. S. Edit., p. 109.)

II.

"In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the popish mass, with the altar and priesthood that thereto belongeth, we use no wily policy, but with open mouth at all times, and in all places, we cry out upon it. The sacrifices, priests, and altars of the Gentiles were abominable.

"The sacrifices of the Jews, their priests, and altars, are all accomplished and finished in the only sacrifice of Christ, our High Priest, offered once for all upon the altar of the cross: which Christ our Saviour, seeing He is a High Priest according to the order of Melchisedec, hath an eternal priesthood, and such as passeth not by succession. (Heb. vii.) Therefore *did*

NOT Christ at His last supper institute *any* EXTERNAL *propitiatory sacrifice* of His body and blood, but a *sacrament,* joined with the *spiritual sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving: which sacrament being administered by the ministers thereto appointed, the sacrifice is so common to the whole Church of the faithful, who are all spiritual priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, as much as the minister of the word and sacraments." (Ibid. p. 241.)

III.

"Beza saith expressly in this place (1 Cor. x.), that to bless here is to sanctify or consecrate, because that the ordinance of God being rehearsed and set forth, the bread and wine are appointed to this holy use, that they should be the *sacraments of* the true and natural body and blood of Christ, that is, the *signs and pledges thereof,* and that in such sort, that the same thing which is signified is *offered to us* to be *received spiritually.*" (Ibid. pp. 501, 502.)

IV.

"Master Whitaker is not so young a divine, but he knoweth that Chrysostom speaketh of the ineffable manner of Christ's presence spiritually, though He be absent corporally: as in the place by you cited, *de sacerdotio,* it is most manifest, where he saith that we may 'see the people dyed and made red with the precious blood of Christ;' which as it is not with the eye of the body, but with the eye of faith, so is Christ that is *corporally present* in heaven, *spiritually present unto* THE FAITH *of the worthy receiver.* . . . 'It is a famous place' indeed, that never a one of the ancient writers could consider for any real presence to be drawn out of it." (Ibid. pp. 510, 511.)

V.

"Here is *no* SACRIFICE of *the body and blood of Christ,* but of *bread and wine for the mystery thereof;* no SACRIFICE *propitiatory for sins, but of thanksgiving,* and REMEMBRANCE *of the propitiation* made by the Lamb Himself, in hope of eternal redemption; no oblation by the priest only, but by the whole Church and every member thereof, as was the oblation of the Paschal Lamb, whereunto he compareth this sacrifice, interpreting those words of Exodus xii.: 'Every man shall take a lamb according to their families and households, and offer him in

sacrifice at the evening.' That is to say, (saith Ceolfride,) all Christian Churches, etc., as before. By which words it is manifest, that the Papists now-a-days are departed even from that faith of the sacrament and sacrifice thereof that Augustin brought from Rome." (Answers, P. S. Edit., p. 8.)

VI.

"The Church of English Saxons believed the sacrament to be the body and blood of Christ, not carnally, but spiritually; expressly denying as well the CARNAL PRESENCE as *Transubstantiation*, which the Papists hold." (Ælf. Serm. Pasc. and Ep., Ibid. p. 20.)

VII.

"In the English Saxon Church the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not then hanged up to be worshipped, nor carried in procession, because they had not the opinion of CARNAL PRESENCE which the Papists have," etc. "The English Saxons' Church DENIED *that* WICKED *men received the body and blood of Christ.*" (Ælf. Serm. Pasc.) "The Papists hold that not only wicked men, but also brute beasts eat the body of Christ, if they eat the external *sacrament thereof.*" (Ibid. p. 21.)

VIII.

"The calf that was killed was by God's appointment a sacrifice of the only and singular Sacrifice of Christ's death, and not by virtue of the signification; for the Jews had other ceremonies than sacrifices, which did signify the death of Christ: but the Lord's Supper is *not* by God's appointment a SACRIFICE; therefore the signification cannot make it so." (Ibid. p. 382.)

JEWEL.

Neal says of John Jewel, "He was born in Devonshire, 1522, and educated at Christ Church College, Oxon., where he proceeded M.A. 1544. In King Edward's reign he was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, but not having the courage of a martyr, he yielded to some things against his conscience in the reign of Queen Mary, for which he asked the pardon of God and the Church, among the exiles in Germany, where he continued a confessor of the Gospel till Queen Elizabeth's accession, when he returned home, and was preferred to the bishopric of Salisbury, in 1559. . . . He was a truly pious

man, and died in a comfortable frame of mind. Some of his last words were, 'I have not so lived that I am ashamed to die; neither am I afraid to die, for we have a gracious Lord. There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness. Christ is my righteousness. Lord, let thy servant depart in peace,' which he did at Mockton-Farley, September 25, 1571, in the fiftieth year of his age, and lies buried in the middle of the choir of the Cathedral of Salisbury." ("History of the Puritans," i., p. 183.)

Jewel's powerful voice made itself so clearly heard, not in England only, but on the Continent;[1] he was so much regarded as the spokesman of the Reformed Church of England, the influence he exercised under Elizabeth was so great, moreover he has been so referred to in support of the arguments by which "the Real Objective Presence" has been defended, that we must occupy some space in extracts from his writings.

I.

"To conclude, Three things herein we must consider:—First, that we put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified.

"Secondly, That we seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine *not Him to be present bodily upon the earth.*

"Thirdly, *That the body of Christ is to be eaten by* FAITH ONLY, and NONE OTHERWISE." (Sermon and Harding, P. S. Edit., p. 449.)

II.

"Now consider thou, good Christian reader, with thyself, whether it be better to use this word '*figure*,' which word hath been often used of Tertullian, St. Augustine, and of all the rest of the ancient Fathers, without controlment; or else those new-fangled words, 'really,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to shew that, in this case of being REALLY IN the sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used." (Ibid. p. 49.)

III.

"Cyrillus saith: 'Our sacrament teacheth us not to eat a man (with the material *mouth of our body*) in ungodly sort leading the minds of the faithful unto gross cogitation. It is a holy

[1] See Strype's Parker, Book iv., Chap. v., p. 317, and Strype's Annals, Vol. i., Chap. xxv., pp. 284-288. Also Heylin's "History of Reformation," E. H. S. Edit., Vol. ii., pp. 328-330, 385-387.

mystery, and a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven and there teaching us to eat the body of Christ, and to drink His Blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but *inwardly* by *our* FAITH, and that verily and indeed. The truth hereof standeth not in any REAL *or* CORPORAL PRESENCE, but, as Hilarius saith, in a *mystery*, which is, in a *sacrament:* whereby outwardly and unto our senses we express that thing in our bodies that must be wrought inwardly in our minds.'" (Ibid. pp. 475, 476.)

IV.

"Like as the body or compass of the sun, being in one certain place of the heavens, reacheth out his beams and giveth influence into the world; even so Christ, the Sun of Justice, being in heaven in one place at the right hand of God, likewise reacheth out His beams, and giveth His influence into the faithful, and so feedeth them, not by bare imagination of fantasy, but *truly*, *substantially*, and *indeed.* And as the sun is more comfortable and more refresheth the world, being absent, by his beams, than if his very natural substance and compass lay here upon the earth; even so the body of Christ, being in the glory of the Father, in the very substance and nature of the flesh, and there evermore entreating mercy for our sins, is much more comfortable unto us, and more quickeneth both our bodies and souls by His heavenly and spiritual influence, than if it were here present freshly before our eyes. And as the sun, not coming down from heaven, nor leaving his place, is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our faces, in our hands, and in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving His room there, yet nevertheless is present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of His body and blood." (Ibid. p. 499.)

V.

"And where he saith, the sacraments of the New Testament contain covertly under them the thing itself that they signify, and that according to Christ's promise; verily this saying covertly containeth a great untruth. For as he is not able to allege any ancient learned Father that ever once mentioned this privy and secret being under such covert, so he is not able to show that Christ ever made him any such promise

touching the same." (Harding, Thess., etc., P. S. Edit., p. 602.)

VI.

"It appeareth by the witness of the ancient learned doctors and fathers, that we are really and corporally joined and united unto Christ, not only by the mysteries of the holy Supper, but also by faith, by baptism, by the Spirit of God, by love, and other ways." ("Apology and Defence," P. S. Edit., p. 494.)

VII.

"St. Augustine saith: 'They washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb, that is to say, in the grace of God through Christ.' This grace flowing from Christ's body upon the cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration of the holy mysteries, oftentimes beareth the name of Christ's body, and is the ground and substance of the sacrament; and whosoever is partaker *of this grace is also partaker of Christ's body*. Therefore St. Augustine saith: 'Whereas the sacraments were common to all, yet the grace thereof was not common to all: and that is the power and strength of the sacraments.' . . . Here M. Harding once again moveth a very needless question. 'We demand,' saith he, 'whether we receive the same body of Christ by faith only, without our body, or with the office of our body.' Any child might soon be able to assoil this riddle. Rabanus Maurus saith, as it is alleged before: The *sacrament* is received with the *bodily* mouth; but with *the virtue* of the sacrament (which is the *body of Christ*) the *inner man* (that is, not the body, but the soul) *is filled*." (Ibid. p. 487.)

VIII.

"Now, as the body of Christ is seen, so is it touched; and as it is touched, so is it eaten. But it is *not seen with bodily eyes;* it is not *touched with bodily fingers;* for St. Ambrose saith: 'By FAITH *Christ is touched;* by FAITH *Christ is seen.*' Therefore the body of Christ is NOT EATEN *with the bodily mouth,* but ONLY *by* FAITH, which is the *spiritual mouth of the* soul." (Ibid. p. 531.)

IX.

"Again he saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in Him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say

with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (NOT CHRIST'S VERY BODY and BLOOD, *but*) the *sacrament* of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire. They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouths.

"So St. Augustine saith again: 'The advouterer is guilty of everlasting death, because he despised in himself the blood of our Saviour.' The distinction that you imagine between REAL *receiving* in the wicked, and EFFECTUAL *receiving* in the godly, as it is only of yourself, without the authority of any doctor, Greek or Latin, so is it nothing else but a very 'effectual' and 'real' folly. For the very body of Christ, *if it be* NOT EFFECTUALLY received, is NOT *received*. Christ Himself saith: 'He that eateth me shall live by me.' St. Ambrose saith: 'This bread is the remission of sins. He that receiveth it shall not die the death of a sinner.'" ("Defence and Letters," p. 895.)

X.

"You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Ibid. p. 895.)

XI.

"Neither do we say that Christ, in the sixth chapter of John, speaking of the spiritual eating by faith, made mention of any figure, but only of HIS VERY FLESH AND VERY BLOOD, INDEED AND VERILY TO BE EATEN AND DRUNKEN. Notwithstanding we say that Christ, afterward in His last supper, unto the same spiritual eating *added* also an *outward sacrament*, which of the old Fathers is oftentimes and commonly called a *figure*." (Sermon and Harding, p. 453.)

XII.

"And St. Augustine saith: 'The *sacrament* is received from the Lord's table, of some unto life, of some unto destruction:

but THE THING ITSELF whereof it is a sacrament (*that is, the body of Christ*) is *received of* EVERY MAN *unto life*, and of no man unto destruction, whosoever be partaker of it.'" (Ibid. p. 453.)

XIII.

"Therefore *wicked* men, and such as BELIEVE *not*, *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST: they have NO PORTION *in it*. So saith Origen: 'The body of Christ is the true food, which no evil man can eat; for, if the evil man could eat the body of our Lord, it should not be written, "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."'" (Harding, Thess., p. 1120.)

XIV.

"This is the undoubted meaning of the old Fathers, that the *wicked are* NOT PARTAKERS *of the passion of Christ*, because they lack FAITH, *whereby* ONLY *Christ is received* of us. As Augustine saith: 'How shall I hold Christ, being absent? how shall I thrust my hand up into heaven, that I may hold Him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou holdest Him.' By this means we draw nigh to Christ, we hide ourselves in His wounds, we suck at His breast, we feed of His body, and comfortably lay up in our mind that His flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes." (Ibid. p. 1121.)

XV.

"The *sacrament* is eaten as well of the wicked as of the faithful: *the* BODY is *only eaten of the* FAITHFUL. The *sacrament* may be eaten unto judgment; *the* BODY *cannot be eaten but unto* SALVATION. *Without the* SACRAMENT we may be saved; but *without the* BODY OF CHRIST we have *no salvation*, we cannot be saved. As St. Augustine saith: 'He that receiveth not the flesh of Christ hath not life; and he that receiveth the same hath life, and that for ever.'" (Ibid. pp. 1121, 1122.)

XVI.

"But Christ, when He spake these words, meant not the receiving of the sacrament, but the spiritual EATING OF HIS VERY BODY, and the spiritual *drinking* of His very blood; whereof *he is made partaker* unto resurrection and life everlasting *whosoever* BELIEVETH *in the death of Christ.*" ("Apology and Defence," p. 532.)

XVII.

"Verily, Christ promised His body to be received by *faith*, and *by* FAITH ONLY, and none otherwise." (Ibid. p. 532.)

XVIII.

"St. Chrysostom concludeth thus: 'The thing that we do is done in remembrance of that thing that was done before. For Christ said, Do this in my remembrance.' Hereby it appeareth in *what sense* the old Fathers used these words, '*oblation*' and '*sacrifice*.'" (Sermon and Harding, p. 171.)

XIX.

"Now, touching the adoration[1] of the sacrament, M. Harding is not able to shew neither any commandment of Christ, nor any word or example of the Apostles or ancient Fathers concerning the same. It is a thing very lately devised by Pope Honorius, about the year of our Lord 1226; afterward increased by the new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day, by Pope Urbanus, anno 1264; and last of all confirmed for ever by multitudes of pardons in the council of Vienna by Pope Clement the fifth, anno 1310. The Church of Asia and Græcia never received it until this day. The matter is great, and cannot be attempted without great danger. To give the honour of God to a creature that is no God, it is manifest idolatry. And 'all idolaters,' as St. John saith, 'shall have their portion in the lake burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.'" (Sermon and Harding, p. 516.)

XX.

"Origen in that whole place speaketh not one word, *neither of* WORSHIPPING *the* SACRAMENT nor of Christ's REAL *or* CORPORAL BEING *therein*, nor of material entering into our bodies." (Ibid. p. 536.)

XXI.

"If M. Harding will gather hereof that Origen teacheth us to adore the sacrament, then must he also say that Origen like-

[1] The reader is particularly requested to observe Jewel's sayings concerning "Adoration," because he too (like Ridley) has spoken of *worshipping* the elements, saying in his reply to Harding: "Neither do we only adore Christ, as very God, but also we WORSHIP *and reverence* the Sacrament and holy mystery of Christ's body." Words which appear to have been strangely misunderstood in a paper published under the title, "Was John Jewell a heretic?" (Pickering.) See note above on Ridley.

wise teacheth us to adore the bishop, or any other godly man, and that even as God, and with godly honour." (Ibid. p. 537.)

XXII.

"But M. Harding will reply, Chrysostom saith: 'As Christ was in the stall, so He is now upon the altar; and as He was sometimes in the woman's arms, so He is now in the priest's hands.' True it is Christ was there, and Christ is here; but not in one or like sort of being. For He was in the stall by BODILY PRESENCE; upon the holy table He is by *way of a* SACRAMENT. The woman in her arms held Him REALLY; the priest in his hands holdeth Him only *in a* MYSTERY. So saith St. Paul: 'Christ dwelleth in our hearts;' and no doubt the same Christ that lay in the stall. It is one and the same Christ; but the difference standeth in the manner of His being there: for in the stall He lay by presence of His body; in our hearts He lieth by presence of faith. If this exposition seem to M. Harding over exquisite or curious, then will I say further: Christ is so upon the table as the faithful people is upon the table. St. Augustine, speaking to the people, saith thus: 'You are upon the table, you are in the cup.' But the people is not there grossly, really, and indeed, but in a mystery. Even so is Christ's body upon the table, not grossly, not REALLY, or *indeed*, but *in a* MYSTERY." (Ibid. p. 539.)

"But they will reply, St. Ambrose saith: 'We do adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries.' Hereof groweth their whole error. For St. Ambrose saith not, we do adore the mysteries, or the flesh of Christ really present, or *materially contained in the mysteries;* as it is supposed by M. Harding. Only he saith: 'We adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries,' that is to say, in the ministration of the mysteries. . . . But THIS *adoration* . . . neither is directed to the sacraments nor requireth any CORPORAL OR REAL PRESENCE. So St. Hierome saith: 'Paula adored Christ in the stall,' and that he himself adored Christ in the grave.

"And St. Chrysostom teacheth us to adore Christ's body in the sacrament of Baptism. Yet neither was Christ's body then really present in the stall,[1] or grave; nor is it now present in

[1] Harding had quoted from St. Ambrose, "Per scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysteriis adoramus." Jewel argues that *such* adoration was paid to Christ in the stall and the grave, when Christ was no longer really present in either.

Dr. Pusey has said, "The question then, as to the adoration of our Lord present

the water of Baptism. Thus St. Ambrose saith, 'We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.'" (Ibid. pp. 542, 543.)

in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. People have profanely spoken of 'wafer-gods.' They might as well have spoken of 'fire-gods.' . . . Much more might they have used the title, 'Infant God,' as a term of reproach against the Holy Child, Jesus. The simple question is, 'Is our Lord and God present there?' If, or rather since, He is present there, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress which He wore as man."

I can hardly think that some portion of the above was not somewhat hastily written. "The Holy Child Jesus" was *a* DIVINE PERSON *incarnate*, having taken upon Him our flesh, "so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together *in* ONE PERSON, never to be divided." (Art. ii.) Is it really meant that on the Altar *a* DIVINE PERSON becomes in like manner *impanate*, so that two whole and perfect natures, the nature of Christ and the nature of bread, should be joined together *in* ONE PERSON? There are indeed some sayings of those who teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, which seem to make too near an approach to something like this; as where we read, "a real union—in the Incarnation between the Eternal WORD and man's nature, and in the Eucharist between the Person of Christ and the elements of bread and wine. . . . What was done in the Incarnation is renewed in the sacrament." ("Tracts for the Day," v., p. 16.) Again, "Both in the Incarnation and in the Eucharist the mystery is formed by the union of two natures, which remain distinct without mixture or confusion." (Ibid. p. 17.) Again, "To say that He . . . WAS MADE MAN, enforces the additional confession that . . . He *incarnates* Himself, so to say, in the *bread and wine* of the holy Eucharist. . . . The Eucharist is the *Complement* and *Extension* of the *Incarnation*." (Ibid. p. 44.) But I cannot suppose that either Dr. Pusey or the writer of the Tract would maintain *such* an *impanation*. And indeed it may perhaps be said that the words of Dr. Pusey, in the context, shew that he is only maintaining *a Presence*, and that the outward forms should not hinder that Presence from being adored. But to this it must be answered—that not every presence of God is *adorable*. God is present everywhere. God was present in the golden calf. Yet not the less did His people commit idolatry when they worshipped Him *under the form* of a graven image. In like manner it seems to me, there is peril of idolatry in worshipping the presence of God under *any other form*, unless that presence be indeed either, (1), Such a presence as that of the *Incarnate Word*, which is of necessity *adorable*, (such a presence, as that we should be able to say to the very present visible object of our adoration, as to *a* PERSON "My Lord and My God," "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"); or, (2), A presence with such a manifestation as commands adoration, or, (3), A presence with direct injunction to adore. Tyndale has said, "If they will say, where Christ's blood is, there is His body, and where His body is, there is His soul, and where His soul is, there is the Godhead and the Trinity. . . . And there men ought to pray, and say, 'O Father, which art present with Thy Son, Christ, under bread and wine, or in form of bread and wine' . . . then as the old prophet for like idolatry denieth God to dwell in the temple . . . even so deny I the body of Christ to be any more in the sacrament than God was in the golden calves . . . for though God be present everywhere, yet if heaven of heavens cannot compass Him . . . and much less the temple that was at Jerusalem, how should He have a dwelling place in a little wafer or crumb of bread? . . . Christ, though He affirmed Himself to be the Son of God, and His Father to be in Him, yet He taught not His disciples to direct the prayer to the Father in Him, but up to the Father in heaven; neither lift He up His eyes to His Father in the sacrament, but to His Father in heaven. . . . Though God's presence be everywhere, yet will He be prayed to up the place only where we shall see Him, and where He would have us to long for to be." ("Doctrinal Treasures," P. S. Edit., pp. 381-383.)

XXIII.

"So if M. Harding will likewise demand wherefore we adore not the sacrament with godly honour, the godly simple man

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says: "The commandment to worship God alone is so express; the distance between GOD and BREAD dedicated to the service of God is so VAST, the DANGER of worshipping that which is NOT GOD, or of not worshipping that which is God, is so FORMIDABLE, that it is infinitely to be presumed that if it had been intended that we should have worshipped the holy sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God, or Jesus Christ, or have BIDDEN US *in express terms* to have adored it; that either by the first, as by a reason indicative, or by the second, as by a reason imperative, we might have had sufficient warrant direct or consequent to have paid a divine worship. Now that there is no implicit warrant in the sacramental words of 'This is my body,' I have given very many reasons to evince, by proving the words to be sacramental and figurative. Add to this, that supposing Christ present in their senses, yet as they have ordered the business, they have made it superstitious and idolatrical; for they declare that 'the divine worship does belong also to the symbols of bread and wine, as being one with Christ;' they are the words of Bellarmine; that even the species also with Christ are to be adored, so Suarez; which doctrine might upon the supposal of their grounds be excused, if, as Claudius de Sainctes dreamed, they and the body of Christ had *but one existence;* but this themselves admit not of, but he is confuted by Suarez. But then let it be considered, that since those species or accidents are not inherent in the holy body, nor have their existence from it, but wholly subsist by themselves (as they dream), since between them and the holy body there is *no substantial,* NO PERSONAL UNION, it is not imaginable how they can pass divine worship to those accidents which are not *in the body,* nor *the same with the body,* but by an impossible supposition subsist of themselves, and were proper to bread, and now *not communicable to Christ,* and yet NOT COMMIT IDOLATRY; especially since the Nestorians were by the fathers called ἀνθρωπολάτραι or 'worshippers of a man,' because they worshipped THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST, which they supposed not to be 'personally' but 'habitually' united to the divinity." ("Real Presence," Sect. xiii. 1, vol. vi., p. 163.)

Archbishop Ussher says: "They who opposed the idolatry of those times, and more especially the 338 bishops assembled together at the Council of Constantinople, in the year 754, maintained that Christ 'Chose no other SHAPE or TYPE under heaven to represent his incarnation by, but the *sacrament;*' which 'he delivered to his ministers for a TYPE and a most *effectual* COMMEMORATION thereof;' 'commanding the *substance of* BREAD to be offered, which did not any way *resemble the form of a man,* that SO NO OCCASION *might be given of bringing in* IDOLATRY:' which bread they affirmed to be the body of Christ, not φύσει, but θέσει, that is, as they themselves expound it, 'a holy' and 'a true IMAGE *of his* NATURAL FLESH.'" (Archbishop Ussher, Answer to Jesuit's Challenge, in Works; vol. iii., pp. 79, 80.)

"Fiat, quod fieri voluit Christus cum dixit, *Hoc facite;* nihil reliqui fiet, quod monstret Sacerdos, quod adoret populus, de pyxide." (Bishop Andrewes, Responsio ad Bellarm: Edit. Oxford, p. 267.)

Canon Trevor writes: "When it is known that not a word of 'Eucharistic adoration' exists for a thousand years after Christ, thoughtful men will be inclined to test the sacramental presence by the proved absence of adoration, rather than graft the adoration on a particular interpretation of the presence. That Christ is to be adored wherever he is, is a truism which no Christian disputes; ['in et cum Sacramento; . . . ubi ubi est, adorandus est.' Bishop Andrewes], but when it is said that he is to be adored in the sacrament, the question returns upon us whether 'sacrament' means the visible symbols of his body and blood, or the whole rite in which he is undoubtedly present to the faithful communicant? In the latter sense we all adore him." ("Sacrifice and Participation," p. 108.)

may make him this answer: Because it was ordained reverently to be received, and not to be adored, as a sacrament, and not as God." (Ibid. p. 551.)

Hooker.

Richard Hooker, born 1554. Through the kindness of Bishop Jewel, he was sent to study at Oxford, where he became Fellow of C.C.C. He was made Master of the Temple in 1585, when he became involved in controversy with the Puritan Walter Travers. Four books of his "Ecclesiastical Polity" were published in 1594, a fifth in 1597, and the last three after his death. He died at Bishopsbourne in 1600.

The extracts following (all but the last) are taken from Hooker's great work, "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," written to defend the Church of England against her assailants.

I.

"It followeth that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of Christ, and consequently not *Christ as man* or Christ according to *His human nature can possibly* be everywhere present. . . . That which excludeth Him therefore as man from so great largeness of presence, is only His being *man*, a creature *of this particular kind*[1] whereunto the God of nature hath set those bounds of restraint and limitation,[2] beyond which to attribute unto it

[1] These italics are Hooker's.

[2] The reader is asked carefully to observe that Hooker (after the example of other Reformers) grounds his argument against *ubiquity*, not at all on the necessity of *some* limitations of the capacity of Christ's body of being spiritually present (see "Tracts for the Day," v., pp. 40, 41), but upon the *impossibility* of *Christ's body* (because it is a TRUE HUMAN BODY) being REALLY *present* AT ALL in more places than one, though its presence of conjunction with Deity, of operation and efficacy, which is *after a sort* presence, be altogether unlimited. Hooker teaches plainly that Christ's body *is* (because of its *truth*) subject to all the limitations with which ours is bounded. His argument seems to have been misunderstood by the writer of "Tracts for the Day," No. v., who (p. 36) after quoting from Hooker, says: "It is this conjunction with Deity that gives to our *Lord's body* a *capacity of presence* and of action beyond the sphere of that locality which He occupies in Heaven. It sets Him free from the laws which limit the operations of other bodies." And again (p. 35): "It (Christ's body) is still consubstantial with ours, yet not subject to the limitations with which ours is bounded." Again, when the writer says (p. 13), "When Hooker says that we 'cannot participate Christ without His presence,' he means the presence of His human nature," it may be well to observe that the words quoted from Hooker are followed immediately by these: "We are briefly to consider HOW Christ *is present*" (vol. ii., p. 238); and that Hooker's treatment of this subject excludes ANY *presence* of Christ's *body on earth*, and "any *mixture* of the *substance* of His flesh with ours." (Page 255.)

In another part of the same tract (p. 29) are quoted the following words of Bishop

anything more than a creature *of that sort* can admit, were to give it another nature. . . . The substance of *the body of Christ*

Taylor concerning the body of Christ, which was crucified, dead and buried, and is now ascended: "I know none else (*i.e.*, no other body) that He had or hath; there is *but one* body of Christ natural and glorified . . . there is *no other body.*" And these words are applied in support of an argument that the *same body* of Christ which is now in heaven *must needs* also be present with a real objective presence ("the presence of His very true body—not anything different from the body which He had on earth, and which He took up into heaven") under the form of bread in the Eucharist. The same words had also been cited by Dr. Pusey in "Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent" (page 70).

But Jeremy Taylor wrote those words as leading to an argument that there *cannot possibly* be *any* REAL PRESENCE *of that body* AT ALL on the altar or anywhere else than in heaven. Compare his words a little before (vol. vi., p. 17): "They say that Christ's body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after the manner of being as an angel is in a place; that's their 'spiritually:' but we by the 'real spiritual presence' of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence." And further on: "Here is the first CONTRADICTION. The body of Christ is in *the sacrament:* the *same body* is in *heaven.*" (Page 105.) And again: "When we speak of a body, all the world means that which hath a *finite* quantity, and is *determined to one place.*" (Page 106.) And again: "To make the body of Christ to be in a thousand places at once and yet to be but ONE BODY, to be *in heaven* and to be upon *so many altars*, to be on the altar in so many round wafers, is to make a body to be a spirit, and to make a finite to be infinite. . . . Neither will it be sufficient to fly here to God's omnipotency." (Page 107.) And again: "That the omnipresence of God should be brought to prove it *possible* that a *body* may be in *many places*, truly though I am heartily desirous to do it, if I could justly, yet I cannot find any colour to excuse it from *great impiety.*" (Page 117.)

Truly it is a strange argument of Bellarmine in favour of the corporal presence: "Qui dicit, inter ea, quæ potest Deus, esse etiam, ponere *unum corpus in pluribus locis*, hic Deum exaltat, et hominem deprimit, cum fateatur plura posse facere, quam nos intelligamus." ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. iii., p. 662.)

There is a wide difference between Divine truths which are *above* our apprehension (before which our reason is to bow down, and our vain thoughts to be hushed in reverent submission), and assertions which we discern by the understanding which God has given us to be actually absurd. "We can never assent," says Locke, "to a proposition that affirms *the same body* to be in *two distant places* at once, however it should pretend to the authority of a divine revelation: since the evidence, first, that we *deceive not ourselves* in *ascribing it to God*, and secondly, that we *understand it right*, can NEVER BE SO GREAT as the evidence of our own intuitive knowledge, whereby we DISCERN IT IMPOSSIBLE." ("On Human Understanding," iv., c. 18, quoted by Archdeacon Martin, "Answer to Bishop of Salisbury," p. 108), who says (pp. 100-104): "If it be pretended, that in the consecrated elements there be hidden any body, not only invisible and impalpable, but unextended also and unfigured, and not locally in place; then that pretended body is certainly not Christ's real body, but a vain imagination, or an idol which is 'nothing in the world.' . . . Vain is an appeal to the omnipotence of God, which was called of old 'the sanctuary of heretics:' for thus men might fain, as a Father said, 'quid vis,' whatever you please, of God: and so, for example, the Arians did feign, that the Omnipotent could make Christ, a creature, to be God. But the answer was, and is, that omnipotence cannot make false things not false, or two contradictory propositions to be true together: and in this case the contradictions are endless. . . . For the Catholic faith is, that the human nature of Christ '*is, and was, of the same species with ours.*' (Bellarm., lib. iii., de Christo, c. ii.) Nor can

hath NO PRESENCE, neither *can have*, but *only* LOCAL. . . . There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a TRUE *body* but by the *true* and *natural* properties of His body. Amongst which properties, DEFINITE OR LOCAL *presence* is chief. . . . If His *majestical* body have now any such *new* property, by force whereof it may everywhere even *in substance* present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the *majesty of His estate* extinguished the VERITY *of His nature*." (Keble's Edit., vol. ii., pp. 240-242.)

II.

"His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, His soul and body *not on earth* but in *heaven* ONLY. Yet because this substance is *inseparably joined* to that personal word which by His very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort* by being *nowhere* severed from that which everywhere is present. . . . Presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence. . . . His bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with Deity. . . . As every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the *value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ;* it hath no measured certainty of limits, *bounds of efficacy* unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application*." (Ibid. pp. 242-245.)

III.

"As for any *mixture of the* SUBSTANCE OF HIS FLESH WITH

omnipotence cause, that the same one body should be here organical, and there 'not organical;' or that it should occupy an entire loaf, and yet be whole in every part thereof; or be at once circumscribed, and yet present substantially beyond its outer surface. . . . These, and many other consequences of this substantial presence, are evident and direct contradictions: and if so, as Roman doctors admit, they are beyond the limits of omnipotence—which cannot make anything false and true, or to be and not to be, at the same time."

Dr. Isaac Barrow says: "The Holy Scripture teacheth us that our Lord hath departed, and is absent from us in body. . . . But the Pope and his Lateran and Tridentine complices, draw him down from heaven, and make him CORPORALLY PRESENT every day, in *numberless places* here. The Scripture teacheth us that our Lord is a man, PERFECTLY LIKE TO US, *in all things*. But the Pope and his adherents make him EXTREMELY DIFFERENT from us, as having a body *at once* present in *innumerable* places; insensible, etc., divested of the properties of our body; thereby *destroying his human nature*, and in effect agreeing with Eutyches, Apollinarius, and other such pestilent heretics." (Of the Pope's Supremacy, in Works, Edit. 1683; vol. i., p. 285.)

OURS, the participation which we have of Christ includeth no *such* kind of *gross* surmise."[1] (Ibid. p. 255.)

IV.

"The question is yet driven to a narrower issue, nor doth anything rest doubtful but this, whether when the sacrament is administered Christ be whole *within man only*, or else *His body and blood* be also *externally seated* in the very *consecrated elements* themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into His; and so the one to hold Him *really* but *invisibly* moulded up with the substance of those elements, the other to hide Him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance whereof as they imagine is abolished and His succeeded in the same room." (Ibid. pp. 349, 350.)

V.

"That strong conceit which two[2] of the three have embraced as touching *a literal, corporal and oral manducation of the very substance of His flesh and blood* is surely an opinion nowhere delivered in Holy Scripture, whereby they should think them-

[1] Contrast "He unites His sacred flesh to ours . . . and in order to this union of the flesh of Christ with ours, He first incarnates Himself in the hands of the priest." ("Tracts for the Day," v., p. 16.)

[2] Hooker (leaving outside the views of those who would assign to the Sacrament no end but only to teach the mind, vol. ii., p. 255, and account the Eucharist only a shadow—destitute, empty, and void of Christ) divides the opinions concerning the Lord's Supper under three heads: 1st, The Lutherans' interpretation, or consubstantiation (see pp. 359 and 349); 2nd, The Popish construction, or transubstantiation (see pp. 359 and 349); and 3rd, The opinion of those termed "Sacramentaries" (pp. 355 and 359), among whom he ranges himself.

In like manner Tyndale ("Doctrinal Treatises," P. S. Edit., pp. 366 and 367): "Ye shall understand that there is great dissension, and *three opinions*, about the words of Christ. . . . One part say that these words, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' compel us to believe, under pain of damnation, that the bread and wine are changed into the very body and blood of Christ really. . . . The second part saith: 'We be not bound to believe that bread and wine are changed; but only that His body and blood are there presently.' The third say: 'We be bound by these words only to believe that Christ's body was broken and His blood shed, for the remission of sins; and that there is no other satisfaction for sin than the death and passion of Christ.'" He adds: "The chief hold and principal anchor that the two first have, is these words: 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' Unto these the third answereth as is above said. Other texts they [*i.e.* the Lutherans and Papists] allege for themselves, which not only do not strengthen their cause, but rather make it worse: as the sixth of John; which they draw and wrest to the carnal and fleshly eating of Christ's body in the mouth, when it only meaneth of this eating by faith." (Pages 368 and 369.)

selves bound to believe it, and (to speak with the softest terms we can use) greatly prejudiced in that when some others did so conceive of eating His flesh, our Saviour to abate that error in them gave them directly to understand how His flesh so eaten could profit them nothing, because the words which He spake were spirit; that is to say, they had a reference to a mystical participation, which mystical participation giveth life." (Ibid. pp. 355, 356.)

VI.

"Neither is it ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments; *which grace* also they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, *receive it from* HIM and *not from* THEM. For of sacraments the very same is true which Solomon's wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent; he that turned towards it was not healed 'by the thing he saw, but by Thee, O Saviour of all.'" ("Eccles. Polity," vol. ii., p. 258, Keble Edit.)

VII.

"The sacraments *contain in themselves* no vital force or efficacy, they are not physical but moral instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable." (Ibid. p. 257.)

VIII.

"The REAL PRESENCE of Christ's most blessed body and blood is *not* therefore to be sought for *in the sacrament*, but in the *worthy receiver of the sacrament.*

"And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth: first 'Take and eat;' then 'This is my body which was broken for you:' first 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth 'This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Ibid. pp. 352, 353.)

IX.

"Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; the whole body of the Church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy are either presbyters, or deacons. I rather term the one sort *Presbyters* than *Priests*, because in a matter of so small moment I would not willingly offend their ears to whom the name of *Priesthood* is odious though without cause. . . . Howbeit because the most eminent part both of heathenish and Jewish service did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word *Priest* doth *properly* signify *according to the mind of the first imposer* of that name, their ordinary scholies do well expound it to imply *sacrifice.* Seeing then that SACRIFICE *is now no part of the Church ministry*, how should the name of *Priesthood* be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing. Whereupon when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of greater importance whereof to speak nameth indifferently both flesh. The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient *sacrifices*, namely the *Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ*, although *it have properly now* NO SACRIFICE. As for the people when they hear the name it draweth no more *their minds* to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient because years were respected in the first nomination of both.

"Wherefore to pass by the name, let them use what dialect they will, whether we call it a Priesthood, a Presbytership, or a Ministry it skilleth not: although in truth the word Presbyter doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *Priest* with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. For what are they that embrace the Gospel but sons of God? What are Churches but His families? Seeing therefore we receive the adoption and state of sons by their ministry whom God hath chosen out for that purpose, seeing also that when we are the sons of God, our continuance is still under their

care which were our progenitors, what better title could there be given them than the reverend name of Presbyters or fatherly guides? The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament making so much mention of them doth not anywhere call them Priests. The prophet Esay I grant doth; but in such sort as the ancient fathers, by way of analogy." (Ibid. pp. 469, 471, 472.)

X.

"Tell not us that ye will sacrifice to the Lord our God, if we will sacrifice to Ashtoreth or Melcom; that ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a mass by permission, we shall have a communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken of by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have His ordinances observed and His statutes kept. Solomon took it (as well he might) for an evident proof, that she did not bear a motherly affection to her child, which yielded to have it cut in divers parts. He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart, which lendeth one ear to His Apostles, and another to false Apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, light and darkness, truth and error, traditions and scriptures." (Vol. iii., p. 666.)

PILKINGTON.

James Pilkington, born 1520; educated at Cambridge; elected Fellow of St. John's College, 1539. In 1550 he was appointed by Edward VI. to the vicarage of Kendal, in Westmoreland. In 1554, to avoid persecution, he left England, living at Zurich, Basel, and Geneva. On Elizabeth's accession he was appointed one of the commissioners for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. In 1561 he was consecrated first Protestant Bishop of Durham. He died in 1575.

In 1561, Pilkington preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, on the destruction of St. Paul's Cathedral by lightning. This called forth an angry reply from a Papist, who attributed the calamity to God's judgment to "schismatical service," "pulling down altars," etc. In answer to this Pilkington wrote the work from which the following extracts are made.

I.

"The Church of God, according to the Scriptures, does profess and believe that all faithful Christians, worthily coming to the Lord's Table, receive *by* FAITH in those holy mysteries the *body and blood of Christ*, which was given, broken and shed for the sins of the whole world. This we teach, believe and follow, and exhort all men often to prepare themselves worthily thus to receive." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 552.)

II.

"Wheresoever, therefore, the New Testament or Old writers use this word *altar*, they allude to that *sacrifice* of Christ, figured by Moses, and use the word still that Moses used to signify the *same sacrifice* withal; and rather it is a *figurative*, than a *proper* kind of speech in all such places. And because *altars* were ever used for *sacrifices*, to signify that *sacrifice* which was to come, seeing our Saviour Christ is come already, has fulfilled and *finished* all *sacrifices*, we think it best to take away all occasions of that Popish sacrificing mass (for maintaining whereof they have cruelly sacrificed many innocent souls) to minister on tables, according to these examples." (Ibid. p. 547.)

III.

"For their sacrifice of the mass, that he so much laments to be defaced, and all good consciences rejoice that God of His undeserved goodness has overthrown it, I refer all men to the fifth and last book that the blessed souls now living with God, Bishops Cranmer and Ridley, wrote of the sacrament, whose bodies they cruelly tormented therefore. There whosoever list, may read, and with indifferency weigh the reasons of both parties, and judge with the truth. Stout Stephen would gladly have overthrown that book: but God confounded him, and their names live for ever. So long as that book stands unconfuted, they may bark against the truth, as the dog does against the moon, and not prevail." (Ibid. pp. 547, 548.)

ROGERS.

Thomas Rogers, an eminent theologian, educated at Oxford, where he entered 1568. He was chaplain to Bancroft, Bishop of London. He died 1615.

The extracts are from his "Exposition of the Articles," published in 1586. A corrected edition was put forth in 1607, as "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to be public," and which the Archbishop ordered all the parishes in his province to supply themselves with. (See Goode, "Rule of Faith," vol. ii., p. 288.)

I.

"Which spiritual bread, that He might the better represent, He hath instituted earthly and visible bread and wine, for a sacrament of His body and blood. Whereby He doth testify, that as verily as we receive the bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and tongue, to the nourishing of this life temporal, even so *by* FAITH (which is in place of *hands and mouth to the soul*) we *verily receive the* TRUE BODY and the TRUE BLOOD OF CHRIST our only Saviour, to the cherishing of the spiritual life in our souls." (On Art., P. S. Edit., p. 288.)

II.

"*The adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . The Synusiasts, or Ubiquitaries, which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly." (Ibid. p. 289.)

"Again, of others the same is unworthily received; that is to say, which themselves do not examine, nor judge, neither discern the Lord's body, and do communicate at the table of the Lord and at the table of devils. These may receive the sacrament, but not the true body of Christ." (Ibid. p. 292.)

III.

"*Error and adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . The Ubiquitaries, *both Lutheran* and Popish; they saying the *very body of Christ*, at the Lord's Supper, *is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly;* these affirming, that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Ibid. p. 293.)

IV.

"It is a fable that the mass is a sacrifice, and that propitiatory; . . . a fable, that one and the same sacrifice is

offered in the mass which was offered on the cross; a fable, that the said mass is any whit profitable for the quick, much less for the dead." (Ibid. p. 300.)

V.

"Dangerous deceits. For hereby men are to believe that . . . Christ is *often offered;* contrary to the Scripture. . . . The priest offereth up Christ; contrary to the Scripture. . . . We are to *adore Christ* as always *present;* contrary to the Scripture, where we are taught to *remember Him absent*." (Ibid. p. 301.)

SANDYS.

Edwin Sandys, (or Sandes,) born 1519, was educated at Cambridge, and in 1547 was elected Master of Catharine Hall. In Queen Mary's reign he was imprisoned with John Bradford, but by mediation of Sir Thomas Holcroft, was released. He escaped abroad, and remained for a while at Strassburg, whence, on his wife's death, he removed to Zurich, where he lived in the house of Peter Martyr. Returning to England, after Mary's death, he was consecrated Bishop of Worcester in 1559, together with Grindal (London), Cox (Ely), and Merick (Bangor). He was employed upon the Bishops' Bible. In 1570 he was made Bishop of London. And when Grindal, whom he had succeeded in London, was moved from York to Canterbury in 1576, Sandys took his place at York. He died in July, 1588.

The extracts are taken from sermons published in 1585.

I.

"In this sacrament there are two things, a visible sign, and an invisible grace: there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ; there is an earthly matter, and an heavenly matter. The outward sacramental sign is common to all; as well the bad, as the good. Judas received the Lord's bread; but not that bread which is the Lord to the faithful receiver. The *spiritual part*, that which feedeth the soul, ONLY THE FAITHFUL *do receive*. For he cannot be partaker of the body of Christ, which is no member of Christ's body." (Sermons, P. S. Edit., p. 88.)

II.

". . . Whom the heavens shall keep until the latter day. From *thence* and from no other *altar* shall He come, in His natural body, to judge both quick and dead. His natural BODY

is LOCAL, for *else it were not a natural body :* His *body* is THERE, therefore not HERE : for a natural *body* doth not occupy *sundry places at once*. Here we have a *sacrament*, a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure effectual, of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 88.)

III.

"By FAITH He is *seen*, by FAITH He is *touched*, by FAITH He is *digested*. Spiritually BY FAITH we *feed upon Christ, when we steadfastly believe that His body was broken, and His blood shed for us upon the cross ;* by which sacrifice, offered once for all, as sufficient for all, our sins were freely remitted, blotted out, and washed away. *This* is *our heavenly bread*, our *spiritual food.* This doth strengthen our souls and cheer our hearts. Sweeter it is unto us than honey, when we are certified by this outward sacrament of the inward grace given unto us through His death, when in Him we are assured of remission of sins and eternal life. Better food than this thy soul can never feed upon. This is the bread of everlasting life. *They which truly eat it shall live by it.*" (Ibid. p. 89.)

IV.

"If a prince gave out his letters patent of a gift, so long as the seal is not put to, the gift is not fully ratified; and the party to whom it is given thinketh not himself sufficiently assured of it. God's gift, without sealing, is sure; as He Himself is all one, without changing: yet, to bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of His promise, to His writing and word He added these outward signs and seals, to establish our faith, and to certify us that His promise is most certain. He giveth us therefore these holy and visible signs of bread and wine, and saith, 'Take and eat, this is my body and blood;' *giving unto the signs* the names which are *proper to the things signified* by them; as we used to do even in common speech, when the sign is a lively representation and image of the thing." (Ibid. pp. 303, 304.)

WILLET.

Andrew Willet, born 1562. (His father had been sub-almoner to King Edward, and a sufferer during the persecutions in Queen Mary's reign.) Was Prebendary of Ely; he is said to have been usually called a living library, from the great extent of his reading and of

his memory. He was very celebrated as a preacher, and for his work "Synopsis Papismi" dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. He died in 1621.

I.

"This then is our faith and judgment, that we are verily in this sacrament engrafted into the body of Christ, and do truly eat His flesh and drink His blood; but all this is done *spiritually* ONLY, and BY FAITH." (Quoted in Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 48.)

II.

"*The Protestants.*—That wicked men and infidels CANNOT *in any sense* BE PARTAKERS of the true body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 72.)

III.

"And in this sense we deny not, but that the sacrament may be called a sacrifice, that is, a spiritual oblation of praise and thanksgiving; but that there is a proper and external sacrifice, as in the law of goats and bullocks, upon the cross of the body of Christ; so in the Eucharist, of the same body and flesh of Christ, we hold it for great blasphemy and heresy." (Ibid. p. 28.)

Here we close our review of passages selected from the writings of our English reformers, for the purpose of instituting a comparison between their views on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and those of the maintainers of "the Real Objective Presence." No name has been designedly omitted. The list includes the High Churchmen of the period, as well as some who may be said to have had leanings towards the Puritans. And some special pains have been taken to give a true and faithful representation of the views of those who have been quoted as supporting the doctrine in question. No doubt there are expressions to be found, which, taken alone, might be regarded as not altogether inconsistent with such a doctrine. And from a catena of such passages we might possibly rise impressed with something like a suspicion that some of our Reformers held some modification of the Lutheran view. But of all such extracts[1] it must be said that they are not testing

[1] How inconclusive such extracts are, and liable to mislead as to the real doctrinal views of the writers, may be exemplified by the following quotations from Swinnock. "Men set bread and wine *on the table*, but *Christ setteth* HIS OWN

passages; or rather, in them no real test has been applied to determine the manner of the presence taught. It is far otherwise with the extracts given above. They are purposely selected as testing passages. In them the views of each Reformer on this matter are brought out clearly and distinctly. Some in

BODY AND BLOOD THERE." (Vol. i., Nichol's Edit., p. 173.) "'The gods,' say they, 'are come down in the likeness of men;'—behold, here God the Son *cometh down* IN THE LIKENESS OF BREAD AND WINE." (Ibid. p. 174.) If a Puritan could write thus after the controversies of the sixteenth century, can any one wonder at the language of the Fathers before (as I believe) Transubstantiation and the Real Objective Presence was ever heard of? ONE *testing exposition* of doctrine *neutralises* ALL such expressions. Luther conceded Augustine and Fulgentius. He said at the conference at Marburg: "*You have Augustine and Fulgentius*, but the rest of the Fathers are on our side." But if the Reformed party had Augustine and Fulgentius,—if, that is, Augustine and Fulgentius had passages in their writings which shewed their views to be against "the Real Presence;" and if such declared views from men so prominent were not repudiated by other Fathers,—a strong argument may be made, that having Augustine and Fulgentius we have the other Fathers also.

It would be easy to find many examples to illustrate the inconclusive character of unguarded statements to which no sufficient test has been applied. Let two suffice.

1. Bishop Beveridge has been appealed to and largely quoted from in support of the Real Objective Presence. Yet ONE *testing passage* manifests, with a clearness which can *hardly be exceeded*, how utterly repugnant were his views to any such doctrine:—"The *whole stress* of this great work lies upon OUR FAITH. Unless that be duly exerted and acted, though men come to the Lord's Table, and *feed upon the outward elements* which are there given them, this is *not to eat the Lord's Supper;* for that is a *spiritual* banquet, which *cannot be so much as* TASTED OF, *any otherwise than* BY FAITH. And therefore, they who do not receive it with faith have no cause to complain that they never are the better for receiving the Lord's Supper; for they do REALLY *receive it* NO MORE *than if they were* NOT PRESENT *when it is administered;* and so can expect no more benefit from it than from food or physic which they DO NOT TAKE." ("Frequent Communion," p. 313.)

2. Bishop Ken has also been claimed on the same side; and considering his fondness for using mystical language, it is not surprising that some passages from his writings should be quoted in support of the Real Objective Presence. But there was a pamphlet published by a Roman Catholic in the time of James II., containing animadversions on a sermon preached by him, and which the writer judged inconsistent with the Bishop's published views. From this pamphlet it is evident how the Bishop's doctrinal statements, when *tested*, were directly opposed to the Real Objective view. The writer says: "I saw you exhorted your 'people not to be tottered by every blast of wind, that shall say, Christ is on this altar, or Christ is on that altar, for Christ *is* ACTUALLY *in heaven, and shall* CONTINUE THERE *till He comes to judge at the end of the world.*'" Again: "Your lordship must needs maintain that *what Christ gave, and His apostles received, was* NOTHING ELSE BUT BREAD AND WINE." (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 706-710, and 892-896.)

Archbishop Longley (Posthumous Charge, p. 29) has well said: "A SINGLE *disclaimer* of a meaning which might be attributed to his language, a SINGLE explanation on his part of what might otherwise be doubtful, a SINGLE *correction* of a phrase which might otherwise mislead, surely serves as a *general interpretation* of an author's meaning in other passages where the like correction or explanation does not occur."

words repudiate "*the Real Presence*" altogether; and of the rest we may, I think, say that almost as with one mouth they repudiate those very views which are distinctive of the (so-called) "Real Objective Presence." Here is no hesitating, doubtful language. To have studied these extracts carefully is to feel that we are no longer floating on uncertainties, that we have touched the bottom, that we rest on sure ground, that we *know* what our Reformers *did* think and feel about the doctrine of the Corporal Presence in their own days, that we know too what they *would have* thought and felt and said about the doctrine of the (so-called) Real Objective Presence as it is taught in our days. Here is brought together concurrent, uniform, consentient testimony to the belief that Christ's body and blood are *not* present in the Eucharist after the manner taught by modern Ritualists; for we find our Reformers teaching us that the body and blood of Christ are—

(1) Not to be sought in the elements.
(2) Not received by the unfaithful (except in the sense of receiving the bare outward signs, which *are not*, though they *may be called* by the names of, the things signified).
(3) Not to be adored as present in or under the bread and wine.
(4) Not sacrificed or offered to God under the form of the bread and wine.

Our Reformers were, in fact, very jealous of allowing any such connexion of the *Sacramentum* and the *Res Sacramenti* as should seem either to give to the one, or in any way bind to the one, the honour due to the other.

Of the three things to be considered in the Eucharist—(1) The *Sacramentum*, or sign; (2) The *Res Sacramenti*, or thing signified; and (3) The *benefits* thereof—the Romish and real objective view made the two first inseparable, the third separable; but in the views of our Reformers the first is separable from the other two, but the second and third are absolutely *inseparable:* that is, in other words, by the opponents of the Reformation it is taught that, by reason of the sacramental conjunction, the bread and wine cannot be received without the body and blood of Christ (the sign not without the thing signified), though *these* may be received without any of their benefits —to the condemnation of the unworthy receiver. By the Reformers, on the other hand, it was steadfastly maintained that there is no possibility of separating the reception of the body and blood of Christ from the reception of the benefits which we

receive from them. Unworthy receivers may, in their view, receive the outward sign without receiving Christ at all. But there can be no receiving Christ's body and blood without receiving their saving efficacy. And this reception, in their teaching, can only be by faith. Their views on this matter may be said to be summed up in the words, "He that *eateth Me*, even he *shall live by Me*."

Yet in this view of our Reformers there was (as we shall see hereafter) no reducing the Lord's Supper to bare signs. They regarded Christ as *really present*, and *really*[1] *offering* Himself and all the benefits of His passion and sacrifice to the souls of the communicants. And the guilt of unbelief was, in their view, the guilt of *rejecting and refusing*. They accounted unbelievers to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not because they received THESE (the body and blood of Christ) *unworthily*, but because, without faith they *could not* and DID NOT RECEIVE THEM AT ALL.[2]

[1] See Bradford's Sermons, etc., pp. 488 and 489; and Sandys' Sermons, pp. 302 and 303. "As the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the Word, so are they also most lively and effectually by the Sacraments. . . . All the graces which may flow from the body and blood of Christ Jesus, are in a mystery here *not represented only*, but *presented* unto us." So Jewel: "As Christ offereth His body spiritually to our faith and spirit, even so spiritually by our faith and spirit we receive it." ("Apology and Defence," p. 529.) To the same effect Bullinger: "An objection is made: If sacraments do nothing profit without our faith, then they *depend on our worthiness* or unworthiness; so that they are *not perfect*. I answer, . . . Neither dependeth their perfectness upon the condition and state of the partakers. . . . For that remaineth *perfect and sound* which the Lord hath instituted . . . howsoever men vary and are faithless. . . . Yet because it is *one thing to offer*, and another thing to receive, God verily offereth of His goodness His bountiful gifts unto men to this end, to profit and save them . . . but as the sick patient which refuseth physic, the benefit *offered* doth no more profit . . . not through the default of Him that *offereth* . . . but through the folly of him which *refuseth*." ("Decades," v., pp. 342, 343.)

[2] See Bradford's Sermons, pp. 93, sqq. Jewel says: "Here St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they *receive*, but because they *receive not* the body of Christ. Mark well these words, M. Harding; they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they *receive*, but because they *receive not* the body of Christ." ("Defence of Apology," pp. 894, 895.) So Hutchinson: "These words do not prove that Christ's body is eaten of us really and substantially. For Paul speaketh there of *unworthy receivers*, which *do not* eat Christ's body, which is the bread of life, but the *only* figure and *sacrament* thereof. . . . The *contempt* of God's *sacrament*, not the *contact* or *touching* of Christ's real body, which is now in heaven, bringeth damnation and causeth this guiltiness." (Works, p. 280.) So Cranmer: "You seem to drive all the cause of fear to the dignity of the body of Christ, there corporally present and received; but the Scripture declareth the fear to rise of the indignity and unworthiness of the receivers." ("On Lord's Supper," p. 147.) And again: "He that cometh defiled unto the visible *sacraments*, defileth not *only* the *sacraments*, but the contumely thereof pertaineth also unto Christ Himself, who is the Author of the sacrament." (Page 225.) "Although the sacrament be very bread, yet doth the injury redound to the body of

It is indeed surprising how little hold the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist ever obtained in England. In the early part of Edward VI.'s reign things looked very different. There were great fears, and there was great cause for fear, that Lutherans would gain the ascendancy.[1] Peter Martyr was in England, and M. Bucer and P. Fagius were expected to strengthen his hands in opposing the views of the Reformed. Cranmer was yet supposed to be a firm supporter of "the Real Presence." So also were the bishops who acted with him.

But in a little while these fears were allayed. Peter Martyr[2]

Christ. As if a man break the king's mace . . . the injury is the king's, and the doer shall be taken as a traitor. . . . Wherefore a man may unworthily take the sacrament, and be guilty of the death of Christ, although he receive not Christ's body into his mouth." (Grindal, "Remains," pp. 55, 56.) "*Non dicet Paulus*, Itaque quisquis *ederit corpus* Domini et biberit sanguinem Domini indigne: sed quia indigne sumentes *sacramenta* corporis et sanguinis Christi signis cælestibus contumeliam faciunt, ea contumelia signorum rebus signatis imputatur." (Hooper, ii., p. 498.) "The contempt of the signs is the contempt of the things signified." (Whitgift, iii., p. 383.) "'*Unworthily*' is never joined with *Christ's body*. . . . They eat the said ONLY *sacrament* and the ONLY figure unto condemnation, making themselves, as Paul saith, 'guilty of Christ's body and blood;' which they DO NOT RECEIVE, because they *will* NOT BELIEVE." (Hutchinson, Works, p. 264.) So Bullinger: "He saith not, 'Whoso eateth the *flesh* and drinketh the *blood* unworthily.' . . . If thou marvel how the unbelievers can be guilty of the Lord's body and blood, being eaten *but sacramentally;* learn this out of other places. . . . Although, therefore, the wicked do not eat the Lord's very body nor drink His blood, nevertheless they are guilty of betraying the Lord's body and blood as far as in them lieth. If a rebel tread under his foot the seal or letters of the prince, etc. . . . What marvel, then, if we hear it said, that they which do eat the Lord's bread unworthily, are guilty of the body and blood of Christ? For the bread and the mystical cup are a sacrament and seal of it." ("Decades," v., pp. 466, 467. See also Bradford, i., pp. 93-100; Hooper, ii., p. 49.) The same view is expressed by Jeremy Taylor: "The wicked *receive* NOT *Christ*, but the *bare symbols* only; yet *to their hurt*, because *the offer of Christ is* REJECTED." (Vol. vi., pp. 13, 14. See also Morton on Eucharist, book v., chap. ii., sec. 4, p. 315, sqq.)

[1] See Hooper's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 61; and Burcher's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, ii., p. 652.

[2] Strype supposes the change in Martyr's views to be due to Cranmer. See "Memorials of Cranmer," book ii., ch. xxv., p. 258. Martyr's estimation of Cranmer, and especially of his judgment in this controversy, may be seen in the following extract from Strype:—

"Peter Martyr in the year following this, printed a book of the sacrament, which was the sum of what he had read before upon that point in the University of Oxford. Which book he dedicated to his patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury: and, giving the reason why he made the dedication to him, said, 'That he knew certainly, that Cranmer had so great skill in this controversy, as one could hardly find in any one besides. That *there was* NONE *of the Fathers, which he had not* DILIGENTLY NOTED; *no antient or modern book extant, that he* (Martyr) had not with his own eyes seen noted by the Archbishop's hand. WHATSOEVER BELONGED TO THE WHOLE CONTROVERSY, he said, that the Archbishop had digested in particular chapters, councils, canons, popes, decrees, pertaining hereunto: and that with so great labour, that unless he had been an eye-witness of it and seen it, he could not easily have believed others, if they had told him, in regard of the *infinite toil, dili-*

came boldly forward as a champion against the "Ubiquitarians." Cranmer[1] publicly declared and most ably maintained his changed views. The other suspected bishops were found ranging themselves on the same side. Bucer's resolute Protestantism, no doubt, made its influence felt; but the suggestions of his *modified Lutheranism* seem to have been *carefully eschewed.*[2]

We need not wonder, therefore, that Traheron should be found writing to Bullinger (Dec., 1548): "The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly,[3]

gence, and exactness, wherewith the Archbishop had done it.' He added, 'that the Archbishop had not bestowed *such kind of pains and study in the matter of the sacrament only,* but that he had done the same thing, as to *all other doctrines,* in effect, which in that age were *especially under controversy.* And this that learned man said, he had made good observation of. Nor, as he went on, that he wanted skill, a method and industry in defending what he held. Which might, he said, be known by this, because he had so often conflicted with his adversaries, both publicly and privately, and by a marvellous strength of learning, quickness of wit, and dexterity of management, had asserted what he held to be true, from the thorny and intricate cavils of sophisters (glancing at his controversies with Winchester, who was commonly then called the Sophister), and that he wanted not a will, yea, a mind ready to defend sound and Christian doctrines. That all men did sufficiently understand, who *saw him burn with so great an endeavour of restoring religion,* that for THIS CAUSE ONLY HE HAD GREAT AND HEAVY ENEMIES, and neglected many commodities of this life, and underwent horrible dangers.' The great and intimate converse that Peter Martyr had with Cranmer, gave him opportunity to know him very well: and therefore I have chosen to set down this character that he gave of him, and particularly of his ability in this controversy of the Eucharist." (Strype's Cranmer, book ii., ch. xxv., pp. 257, 258.) Cranmer's opinion of Martyr may be seen in Strype's Annals, vol. i., ch. xxv., p. 288.

[1] Strype says, (Cranmer, book ii., chap. xxv., p. 263) "Thus God made use of the Archbishop [Cranmer], who was once one of the MOST VIOLENT ASSERTERS of the corporal presence to be the CHIEFEST INSTRUMENT of overthrowing it." (See Cranmer's letter to Joachim Vadian, 1537, in "Orig. Letters," P. S. Edit., i., pp. 13, 14; and J. H. Blunt's Reformation, Rivington's, p. 537; also Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops," Series ii., vol. ii., pp. 60, 61.)

[2] See Dr. Blakeney's "Book of Common Prayer," pp. 74-80; especially p. 79; and Canon Estcourt's "Dogmatic Teaching of the Common Prayer," p. 44.

[3] So also John-ab-Ulmis to Bullinger (Nov., 1548; "Orig. Letters," ii., p. 383): "The bishops entertain *right* and *excellent* opinions respecting the holy Supper of Jesus Christ. That abominable error and silly opinion of a carnal eating has been long since *banished* and entirely *done away with.* Even that Thomas [Cranmer] himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John a Lasco, is in a measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy." And again the same to Bullinger (March, 1549; "Orig. Letters," ii., p. 388): "As to what they have reported respecting religion, namely, that there are great differences of opinion, I admit that such *has been* the case to a considerable extent; but I can *now* assert that by the goodness of God the minds of ALL *good men* are disposed to harmony and peace. For the cause of these dissensions is removed in this present parliament; namely, the babbling and dogmas of Antichrist, which are now positively and effectually *banished.* I would here write you word what has been done and determined respecting the Lord's Supper. . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of singular worth and learning, has, contrary to the general expectation, de-

firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion on this subject. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters have altogether come over to our side." ("Original Letters," P. S. Edit., i., p. 323.) Nor that Ridley should speak, both in his writings [1] and in his Conference [2] with Bourne after being committed to the Tower, as if in England ALL learned men were AGREED in opposition to the views of Melancthon and the Lutherans.

Those whose views incline towards the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist are in the habit of lamenting the influence which our English refugees brought with them, on the accession of Elizabeth, from the Continent. They regard them as having acquired an unhappy tendency from their intercourse with and affection towards foreign divines. But, in truth, it may well

livered his opinion upon this subject learnedly, correctly, orderly, and clearly: and by the weight of his character, and the dignity of his language and sentiments, easily drew over *all his hearers to* OUR *way of thinking*. . . . Peter Martyr has openly declared to us all, on this very day on which I write this letter, what was his opinion upon this subject; and he seemed to all of us not to depart even a nail's breadth from that entertained by yourself. Nay, more, he has defended that most worthy man, Zuingle, by the testimony of your opinion, and taken part with him against his adversaries, who falsely object to him that he makes the sacrament a mere sign: he moreover declares that those persons are *out of their senses*, who make the *body of Christ* to be without any *local* habitation, *uncircumscribed*, in *many places at once*, void of shape, and other matters of the like kind." See also Peter Martyr to Bullinger (April, 1551; "Orig. Letters," ii., p. 493), and the same to Bullinger (Jan., 1550; "Orig. Letters," ii., pp. 478-480); also Hooper to Bullinger (Dec., 1549; "Orig. Letters," i., p. 71), and the same (Feb., 1550; "Orig. Letters," i., pp. 76, 77). Traheron also writes to Bullinger (Sept., 1548): "That you may add yet more to the praises of God, you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans." ("Orig. Letters," i., p. 322. See also "Hardwick on Articles," p. 126.)

[1] "The former proposition (*confessed of* ALL that be named to be learned, so far as I do know in *England*), which is, that there is *but* ONE *material substance* in the sacrament of the body, and *one* ONLY likewise in the sacrament of the blood." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 12.)

[2] The Conference "was penned" with Ridley's "own hand." He says (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 160): "'As for Melancthon,' quoth I, 'whom Mr. Fecknam spake of, I marvel that ye will allege him; for we are more nigh an agreement here in England, than the opinion of Melancthon to you: for in *this point we* ALL AGREE HERE, that there is in the sacrament *but* ONE *material substance;* and Melancthon, as I ween, saith *there are* TWO.' 'Ye say truth,' quoth Mr. Secretary: 'Melancthon's opinion is so.'"

It may be worth while, perhaps, to add, that in the later years of his life Melancthon's views underwent very considerable and important modifications, so that he became, in Luther's view, "almost of Zwinglian opinions," and that (while extreme Lutheranism was leading some to maintain the true and proper *ubiquity* of Christ's body: not only that it *may*, while still in heaven, be present *anywhere*, but that it actually *is* present *everywhere*) Luther himself is recorded to have said to Melancthon on his death-bed: "Dear Philip, I confess to have gone too far in the affair of the sacrament." (See Encycl. Britan., 8th Edit., Art. "Luther" at end.)

be questioned whether the religious tendencies of our Reformers (in the matter, at least, of Eucharistic doctrine) were not much rather the cause than the effect of this friendship. There were Lutheran theologians on the Continent as well as those of the opposite school. Why did our Reformers associate almost only with the latter? Why did they not become equally influenced by men of strong Lutheran tendencies? The answer is surely not far to seek. It is contained in this simple fact[1] that the Lutherans had no welcome for our English exiles. Why was it that our English divines found so warm a welcome among the Reformed, and no such reception among Lutherans? Simply because they were known to have taken their sides before. In a word, they went out with warm sympathies —sympathies which had already created friendships—towards the one, and with views decidedly opposed to the other.

Again, on the accession of Elizabeth (when, doubtless, the Lutheran party, strengthened in Mary's reign, had become considerable),[2] overtures proceeded from the English Court, with the idea of joining the great Lutheran (or Smalkaldic) league; and negotiations on the subject of this union were continued eagerly for a while. Here was fresh cause for alarm to the Reformed party. And Bullinger wrote: "I see no small disturbances like to arise in England also, if the Augustan Confession be received, which some would have; a thing very unworthy in many regards. . . . Beware, and lay your helping hand, that it be not received. *King Edward's reformation satisfieth the godly.*" (See Strype's "Annals," chap. ii., p. 53, and "Zurich Letters," ii., p. 17.) The Augustan Confession (*i.e.* the Confession of Augsburg) was *not* received. The negotiations were broken off. And Grindal wrote to Zanchius: "When first her highness Elizabeth, under most happy auspices, began her reign, the Popish doctrine and worship being cast off, she restored all things to *that standard* of the administration of the Word of God, and the sacraments, and whole of religion, which had been drawn up and established during the reign of Edward

[1] The statement of Neal is worth remarking: "Many escaped the fury of the persecution, by withdrawing from the storm, and flying into foreign countries. . . . But the uncharitableness of the Lutherans on this occasion was very remarkable; they hated the exiles *because they were sacramentarians*, and when any English came among them for shelter, they *expelled them* their cities; so that they *found little hospitality* in Saxony and other places of Germany where Lutheranism was professed. Philip Melancthon interceded with the Senate on their behalf, but the clergy were so *zealous for their consubstantiation* that they irritated the magistrates everywhere against them." ("History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 76. See Strype, Cranmer, book iii., chap. xv., Ann. 1554, pp. 353, 354, Edit. 1694.)

[2] See Soames's "Elizabethan History," pp. 15, 16; Hardwick on Articles, p. 126.

VI. of happy, but also of lamented memory." (Remains, pp. 338, 339.)

The Reformed party regained a full and complete ascendancy. And we find Jewel writing to Peter Martyr (Nov., 1560; "Zurich Letters," i., pp. 92, 93): "Our Church, by the blessing of God, is at length in peace. . . . That volatile Ubiquitarian doctrine cannot by any means gain footing among us." And again he writes to the same (in Feb., 1562; "Zurich Letters," i., p. 100): "As to your statement that a kind of *interim* and farrago of religion is aimed at by some parties, may God prevent it!" . . . "As to matters of *doctrine*, we have pared away *everything* to the *very quick*, and do *not differ* from *your doctrine by a nail's breadth;* for as to the Ubiquitarian theory, there is NO *danger in* THIS COUNTRY."

To the same effect Bishop Horn writes to Bullinger (in 1563; "Zurich Letters," i., p. 135): "We have throughout England the *same ecclesiastical doctrine* as yourselves." And again (ibid.): "Of the books you mention in your second letter, I have received three upon the same arguments, against the Ubiquitarianism of Brentius, which subject a certain Englishman has undertaken as you desire . . . that it may be manifest to every one, that the people of England entertain on these points *the same opinions* as you do at Zurich." To the same effect Bishop Parkhurst writes to Josiah Simler (Feb., 1574; "Zurich Letters," i., p. 302): "So far are we English from defending either the Ubiquitarian or any other monstrous opinions, that *we cannot endure them.* We *only dispute* about *ceremonies and habits*, and things of *no importance*." And to the same effect also Bishop Grindal writes to Bullinger (Aug. 27, 1566; "Zurich Letters," i., p. 169):[1] "The pure doctrine of the Gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; in which, even to this day, (notwithstanding the attempts of many to the contrary,) we MOST FULLY agree *with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth.*"[2]

[1] See also Bishop Cox's Letter to R. Gualter (July, 1574; "Zurich Letters," i., p. 307.)

[2] *i.e.* the Helvetic Confession (1566), in which it is declared: "Qui *nullâ cum fide* at hanc sacram Domini mensam accedit, sacramento duntaxat communicat, et *rem sacramenti*, unde est vita et salus, *non percipit.*" And again: "Ergo corpus Domini et sanguinem ejus cum pane et vino non ita conjungimus, ut panem ipsum dicamus esse corpus Christi, nisi *ratione sacramentali* aut *sub pane* corporaliter latitare corpus Christi: ut etiam *sub speciebus panis adorari debeat*, aut quicunque *signum* percipiat, idem et *rem* percipiat ipsam. Corpus Christi in cœlis est, ad dextram Patris." ("Sylloge Confessionum," pp. 85, 86. See Hall's "Harmony of Confessions," p. 319. See also Strype's Annals, vol. i., chap. xlviii., p. 524.)

No. IV.

BOOKS OF SANCTION.

We are now about to pass from the opinions of individual Reformers, to writings which may be regarded as having had given them more or less of the character of sanctioned or authoritative books and documents of the English Reformed Church.

This seems, therefore, to be the proper place for giving a reason, for what may be regarded as a strange and unnatural (perhaps even an unfair) course of proceeding—the fixing our attention *first* on the views of individuals, and ascending step by step, till we reach at *last* the writings of the highest symbolical authority in our Church.

No doubt the opposite course would have been, in many ways, preferable. Yet, there *is* a reason for not adopting it; and a reason, which, when stated, will, I hope, remove all impression of unfairness, and will commend itself to the minds of those who are really desirous of seeing their way clear to forming a fair judgment, and giving a true verdict on the question before us.

I am not wishing to impute anything to the motives of those who differ from me, when I say, that it seems to me to make a very important difference in the view of our Formularies, whether we approach them through the language of modern writers on this subject, or through the language of the Reformers, under whose auspices they were compiled or reformed.

And, this being so, I must be allowed to regard it, as, not only *not unfair*, but only *fair* and *right* that we should draw near to examine them through the language of that Theology, to which they may be said to belong.

But here let me not be misunderstood. I would not ask my readers to gather from my Extracts the views of our Reformers, and then take these views with them that they may put them into, and fasten them on to, our Liturgy and Articles. Against

such a proceeding, I desire most earnestly to caution every one. It does not follow, that the views (however distinct and definite) of individuals (however numerous and influential) should have been of necessity, stamped definitely on the authoritative expositions of our Church's teaching. It would be *most unfair*, to assume that all the opinions of our Reformers must be clearly stamped on our Prayer Book. It would be most unjustifiable to import all the opinions of our Reformers into statements on the same subjects in our Articles. Of course my readers cannot but form their own opinions of the *probability* or *possibility* of our Reformers, with such distinctly expressed opinions, authorizing formularies which should speak either a contrary, or a different, or a doubtful language, on such a subject as that before us.

But the testimony of our formularies is a testimony which is to speak for itself. Their own voice is to be heard. What they say *for themselves* is what we are concerned with. We may not seek to make our symbolical books *mean* more than they *say*, because we may have learnt to know that such an added meaning would only be in accord with the expressed opinions of our Reformers.

It is not for this that I have adopted the course I am defending. It will not, I hope, lead to this, that my previous papers have been filled with Extracts from our Reforming Divines.

My desire is not to sanction senses *imported into* our Formularies but to protect our Formularies from having their true natural meaning cast away, or exchanged for something new and not their own.

Our Articles have a meaning, and that meaning, I conceive, we are bound sacredly to guard. We may not make them mean more than they say. We must not allow them to mean less than in the right interpretation of their language, they clearly *do* say. We must keep watch against the error which would *force* a sense *into* them. But we are bound also to guard them from any force which would rob them of that which in fairness and truth belongs to them.

To aim at such a defence of their sense is, I am persuaded, to aim at doing that which is true and just in our dealings with our Formularies, and with our Reformers from whom we inherit them.

And it is with a view to this, and only this, that I have chosen to approach from lower ground upwards to the Articles of our Church.

If distance of time has made in the language of our Formularies anything which *was clear* to be now at all *doubtful* or anyways *indistinct*, then to look at our Formularies through the language of the Reformation as through a glass, is to use the language of our Reformers only as men use a telescope to remove the obscurities of distance, that they may see things only in their true form and colour, that those things may appear to them as without a glass they would appear if they were nearer. It is not at all to do as *they* do, who would look at objects through such a glass as will colour or distort whatever is seen through it. I only claim for the sense of our Formularies that it should not be regarded as variable, and shifting, like a quicksand, by the force of the tides and currents and undercurrents of rising or falling theological systems.

I only claim for them, that what they clearly and distinctly meant at the time of their settlement, they ought clearly and distinctly to mean *now*—that what doctrines they were felt plainly to exclude *then*, they ought to be seen plainly to exclude *now*—that what opinions they certainly *had* stamped with an unmistakeable character *then*, they ought to be regarded as having those same opinions firmly impressed on them still.

I mean that our Formularies may not be regarded as things to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of human opinion, but must be understood as having some sense, definite and determined; and that that sense we are called upon to uphold unchanged, and to defend at all costs.

And, if this be so indeed, then I contend, that if, and so far as, theological language may have varied in the course of three centuries; if, and so far as, expressions once plain, may have become ambiguous; if, and so far as, language which was exclusive then, may be thought to be inclusive now; if, and so far as, words which may have spoken distinctly the language of one side of the controversy then, may be thought capable of a different meaning now;—it is no more untrue, or unjust, or unfair, to read these in the light of the theological language of the time, than it would be if they had been written in a language now dead, to translate them into our vernacular, or if they contained words now altogether changed in their meanings, to look into an old English dictionary for the true sense they should bear.

Ridley used the word *worship* in a sense we should none of us think of giving to it now. We are not to make Ridley talk nonsense, by forcing the modern meaning of the word into his

sayings. And as little, I contend, may we take any modern senses or explanations or glosses, to mould into shape, to add to or to deduct from, whatsoever may have been originally distinct and clear and obvious in the sense of our Formularies, as they would have been naturally understood in the theological language of their time.

Such then, is the use—the only use—I wish to make of the writings of our Reformers [1] as we approach the inspection of our authorized Formularies, with reference to the question, "Do they or do they not teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?"

But it must not, of course, be supposed that because I disclaim any further use of our Reformers' writings for this purpose, therefore I am prepared to lay down, or mean to put aside, the positive bearing on the question before us, of the cumulative evidence afforded by the unvarying testimony of all our Reformers. If it be so, that our Reformers have, as with one voice, rejected and repudiated the doctrine in question, what *shall* we, (as many of us as have learnt to thank God for the Reformation of the English Church,) what *can* we, think of a system [2] which would teach us to cast overboard our Reformers and the doctrines they held so sacred and precious, and left us to hold sacred and precious too; which would teach us that in those doctrines is a denial of what we ought to hold—not as an opinion only, but as *de fide*, which would then bid us put the helm to, that we might steer our ship back again to the very harbour from which our Reformers set sail, as from a plague-infected land, and this, that we may take on board again the very wares and merchandise, the very same poisonous doctrines of which our Reformers lightened our ship, some of them at the cost of their lives?

[1] That is, for purposes of interpretation. They will be brought forward also as historical evidence, for the purpose of removing objections to the natural meaning of some of our Formularies.

[2] A system, be it observed, very different, indeed, from Lutheranism. The high Lutheran doctrine, indeed, on the Presence (viewed alone) was the same; but it was adhering to a system, to which it may be said to have been strongly repugnant, and which always kept it, more or less straitly, on every side, in bonds. Insomuch that Waterland says, "The Lutherans, when pressed to speak plainly, deny every article almost which they are commonly charged with by their adversaries." (See "Doctrine of Eucharist," vol. iv., ch. viii., p. 640.) How different is the position of this doctrine in a system which incorporates the "Real Objective Presence" into itself, so as to form a congruous whole, and, receiving strength from it, adds also power and energy to it, and gives it free course that it may carry its adherents on to the utmost bounds of (so-called) Catholic Doctrine!

There are, indeed, those who professedly regard our Reformers and the Reformation with feelings of deep repugnance. The position of such, as ministers of the Reformed Church of England, is one which may safely be left to set itself to rights.

We have nothing to do in these papers with strong language and indignant declamation; and I believe it needs nothing but the good common sense of Englishmen to make it felt that, with whatever good intention it may be attempted, such a position is too anomalous to be permanently maintained.

We desire, I trust from our hearts, for such persons nothing worse than that they may learn to prize the Reformation as a blessed work of God, however frail and sinful may have been some of the instruments employed.[1]

We have for our opponents not these—but those who (agreeing in doctrine with them) yet believe and maintain that they are teaching the doctrines taught by our Church, and sanctioned by our Reformation, and upheld by at least one class—the better class—of our Reformers; and our object is to show that as to the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, it was utterly *repudiated* by *our Reformers*, and is *excluded* by the teaching of our Formularies as fairly and truly interpreted. Its repudiation by our Reformers has, I believe, been shewn by their own witness, as alleged in previous papers. Its exclusion

[1] None were more sensible of the evils which accompanied the Reformation than some of the Reformers themselves. Neal, doubtless, is but recording the truth when he writes, "Nor were the lives of many who were zealous for the Reformation free from scandal; the courtiers and great men indulged themselves in a dissolute and licentious life; and the clergy were not without blemishes. Some that embraced the Reformation, were far from adorning their profession, but rather disposed the people to return to their old superstitions: nevertheless, there were many great and shining lights among them, who preached and prayed fervently against the corruption of the times, and were an example to their flocks, by the strictness of their lives and manners; but their numbers were small in comparison to the many that were otherwise, turning the doctrines of grace into lasciviousness." ("History of Puritans," i., p. 54.) "Dr. Littledale bids his readers to liken the English Reformers to those false and villainous prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire. (Jer. xxix. 22.) For their own sakes, I would beseech men to ponder long and seriously before they incur so grave and solemn a responsibility. That Cranmer cannot, in strictness, be reckoned as a martyr, we may be ready, with Dean Hook, to admit; but the same arguments do not apply to the cases of Rogers, Saunders, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and many more.

"So long as it is granted, as it is by Lingard and all fair historians, that these men might have saved their lives by the admission of certain current doctrines respecting the Holy Eucharist and the Papal Supremacy, so long must it be reckoned, I would maintain, a decision contrary to all truth and charity, to say, with Dr. Littledale, that 'they were burnt for their crimes.'" (J. G. Cazenove's "Aspects of the Reformation," pp. 191, 192. See "Principles at Stake," pp. 15, sqq.)

by our Formularies, understood in their plain, obvious, natural sense, with a fair light fairly thrown upon them by the theological language of the Reformation, will I trust be shewn in future papers. Meanwhile we have first to review certain works which may be said either (at certain times) to have received some sanction, or something like sanction, or to be of some lesser authority, or quasi-authority, in the English Church, that after their measure they may add somewhat to the weight of testimony which bears witness to the rejection of the doctrine before us.

I.

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.

The following is a part of Strype's account of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.

"In this parliament [Anno 1571, Eliz. 13] was the last effort I think, made to bring into practice in this realm, by authority of parliament, a body of ecclesiastical and civil laws, that had been carefully framed by Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Goodrick, Dr. Cox now Bishop of Ely, Dr. May afterwards elect of York, Dr. Peter Martyr, Dr. Rowland Taylour afterwards a holy martyr, and some other civilians and common lawyers: and the rubbish of the Popish canons and constitutions being laid aside, this, as a just and complete codex, to be used in the room thereof. Acts of Parliament were passed for this end, both in the time of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI. The work was closely plied and finished by the foresaid learned and excellent men under King Edward, and put into very elegant Latin by the pens of Dr. Haddon and Sir John Cheke, and had certainly been ratified had God spared that King's life till another parliament. Such a body of laws to succeed the old ones had been many years desired by the learnedest and best men of the reformed religion. And now in the present parliament, so active for the reforming of religion, it was moved, as was thought, seasonably. And care was taken to have it printed against the sitting of parliament; which was done by John Foxe from two original MS. copies; the former Archbishop Cranmer's own book (which afterwards fell into Foxe's possession) wherein was much of his own hand, as likewise of Peter Martyr's and other the assistants; the other a copy belonging to Archbishop Parker. Who, I verily believe,

employed[1] and encouraged Foxe in preparing this book for the press. And that he made use of our Archbishop's copy, appears by what Foxe wrote in his own on the head of the page that contains the titles of the whole following book, *viz., Ordo Titulorum in Cod. D.* Matth. *Cant.*, placing those titles according to the said Archbishop's copy communicated to him." (Strype's Parker, book iv., ch. 5, pp. 323, 324. Edit. 1711.)

This book never became law, through the Queen's dislike of parliamentary interference with ecclesiastical matters, and something, it appears, of aversion to the individuals by whom the measure was recommended,[2] not without, perhaps, some dislike of some things in the book itself.

Foxe's edition, however, was published in 1571. This edition, no doubt, was printed from the MS. of Archbishop Parker. And of this MS. it has been said that it "contained the whole code as revised and approved by Archbishop Parker, was made public with the Archbishop's consent in the same year, when the XXXIX. Articles of Religion were finally subscribed by Convocation and ratified by parliament, and represents the state and condition of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Reformation may be said to have been completed."[3]

The following Extracts are taken from Dr. Cardwell's Oxford Edition of 1850 :—

I.

From "De Hæresibus," cap. 5. "*De duabus naturis Christi.*"

". . . Illi delirium imitantur, qui corpori Christi tam latos fines dant, ut illo credant aut *omnes locos* simul, aut *innumeros* obsideri. Quod si confiteremur, humanam e Christo naturam eximeremus. Qui errores . . . sacrarum Scripturarum auctori-

[1] In this Strype may probably be in error. (See Cardwell's note in Preface, pp. x., xi.)

[2] See Cardwell's Preface, p. xii.

[3] Ibid. pp. x., xi. The only "sanction" claimed for the "Reformatio Legum," is that which arises from the fact of its having been twice so nearly made authoritative, and having been designed and prepared for authorization by men whose names of esteem and reverence in the English Church may be said to give some sort of sanction to a work prepared and revised under such auspices for such a purpose. It gives *some* evidence, at least, of the doctrine on this subject which, in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, our ecclesiastical authorities desired and designed to sanction and authorize. Thus regarded, it is not, I trust, unsuitably placed here, that its statements may add somewhat to the testimony of those other books which may be more strictly regarded as having more or less of a quasi-authoritative character.

tate sic corrigendi sunt, ut Christus . . . corpus habeat . . . quemadmodum *reliqua humana corpora* suis loci finibus circumscriptum." (Page 10.)

II.

From "De Hæresibus," cap. 19. "*De transubstantione in Eucharistia, et impanatione, ut vocant, Corporis Christi.*"

"Itaque nec *in altum* tolli sacramentum hoc, nec circumferri per agros patimur, nec *conservari* in Crastinum, nec *adorari;* denique nullum relinquimus majorem Eucharistiæ venerationem, quam baptismi et verbi Dei. Symbola vero panis et vini *nisi pium* et *institutum* a Scripturis *usum communicationis* retineat, non *majorem æstimationem* habere volumus, quam panis et vinum habent, quæ quotidie inter nos in usu habentur. In eodem luto hærent, qui panis et vini substantiam in Eucharistia ponunt sed *vi consecrationis per ministrum appositæ* CORPUS ET SANGUINEM CHRISTI *verum et naturalem* ADJUNGI *putant*, et cum symbolorum naturis permisceri, et SUBTER EAS SUBJICI, *usque adeo ut sive pii sint sive impii*, qui ad Domini mensam se admovent, verum et naturale Christi corpus, et expressum ejus sanguinem, *una cum pane et vino sumant.* Verum symbola sacramentorum quoniam RES QUAS SIGNIFICANT, NON *intra se* CLAUSAS *realiter et substantialiter* (ut loquuntur) CONTINENT; deinde cum sacris Scripturis determinatum sit, Christum suam in cælum *humanam naturam* invexisse, nec *cum illa* sit in terras ante tempus extremi judicii descensurus; præterea cum hoc commentitia naturalis corporis Christi præsentia nullum habeat majus momentum ad ædificationem nostræ religionis quam hæc Christi præsentia quæ fide percipitur, immo multas secum afferat quæstiones inexplicabiles, ac assertiones falsas et portentosas: ABSURDAM HANC DOCTRINAM *qua Christi corpus et sanguis naturaliter et substantialiter* (ut illi loquuntur) *ad Eucharistiam adrepunt, et in eam includuntur,* PRORSUS ABOLERI VOLUMUS. Peregrinum enim est, et alienum a sacris literis; deinde *contrarium humanæ naturæ* VERITATI, quam Christus assumpsit, et a conditione sacramentorum longe dissidens; postremo communis quædam sentina superstitionum multarum in Ecclesiam Dei comportatarum." (Pages 19, 20).

III.

From "De Sacramentis," cap. 4. "*Quid sit Eucharistia quos fructus habeat.*"

" Eucharistia sacramentum est, in quo cibum ex pane sumunt, et potum ex vino, qui convivæ sedeant in sacra Domini mensa: cujus panis inter illos et vini communicatione obsignatur gratia Spiritus Sancti, veniaque peccatorum, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod *fide comprehendunt* et *percipiunt Christi sacrosanctum corpus respectu nostræ salutis ad crucem fixum, et cruorem pro tollendis fusum nostris peccatis*, ut Dei promissa palam ipsa loquuntur." (Page 31.)

IV.

From the same.

" Cum autem ad hæc omnia nec transubstantiatione opus sit, *nec illa quam fingere solebant* REALI PRÆSENTIA CORPORIS CHRISTI, sed potius hæc curiosa hominum inventa primum CONTRA NATURAM HUMANAM sint a Filio Dei nostra causa SUMPTAM, deinde *cum Scripturis divinis pugnent*, et præterea cum universa sacramentorum ratione confligant, *ista tanquam* FRIVOLA *quædam* SOMNIA *merito* DESECANDA CURAVIMUS *et oblivione obruenda, præsertim cum* MAGNUM *ex* ILLIS *et* PERNICIOSUM AGMEN *superstitionum in Ecclesia Dei importatum fuerit.*" (Pages 31, 32.)

V.

From " De Hæresibus," cap. 10. " *De missis et purgatorio.*"

" Quorundam nimis est curiosa perversitas, qui veniam quidem peccatorum expectant, sed hanc morte Christi per solam fidem ad nos accommodatam plane non credunt et omnibus partibus impleri. Quapropter alia conquirunt sacrificia, quibus perpurgari possint, et ad hanc rem missas exhibent in quibus sacrificium Deo Patri credunt oblatum esse, nimirum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi *vere*, quomodoque illi dicunt *realiter*, ad veniam peccatorum impetrandam, et salutem tam mortuorum quam vivorum procurandam.

". . . Qua in re sacrificium illud unicum . . . largiter imminuunt, et *sacerdotium quod unius Christi proprium* est, ad miserabilem hominum conditionem devolvunt." (Pages 12, 13.)

II.

THE CATECHISM OF EDWARD VI., A.D. 1553.

The Catechism of Edward VI. was authoritatively set forth for the use of all schoolmasters throughout England, by letters

patent and injunction of his Majesty King Edward VI., bearing date May, 1553. It is generally attributed to Dr. Ponet (or Poynet), Bishop of Winchester, and was duly examined and approved by certain bishops, and other learned men, among whom were Cranmer,[1] Ridley and others. It is especially worthy of notice as having been, in the words of Bishop Randolph, "the last work of the Reformers in that reign: whence it may fairly be understood to contain, as far as it goes, their ultimate decision; and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established." Under Queen Mary it was suppressed [2] and burnt, and was "the Catechismus Reprobatus" of her first Convocation. Copies of it are now very rare. Archbishop Wake says, "in this the complete model of our Church Catechism was laid." [3] The title is "A Short Catechism; or, Plain Instruction, containing the Sum of Christian Learning, set forth by the King's Majesty's authority, for all schoolmasters to teach." The Latin and English versions are given in the vol. of the Parker Society containing the Liturgies of Edward VI.

The following quotations are taken from an edition published by Whittaker in 1857:—

[1] The consent and approval of Cranmer and Ridley is evident from the following conversation in Ridley's disputation at Oxford. They are quoted in Dr. Blakeney's Book of Common Prayer, p. 88:—

"*Ridley*:—I grant that I saw the book, but I deny that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and I noted many things for it, so I consented to the book. I was not the author of it. *Judges*:—The Catechism is so set forth as though the whole Convocation house had agreed to it. Cranmer said yesterday that you made it. *Ridley*:—I think surely that he would not say so. *Ward*:—The Catechism hath this clause, Si visibiliter et in terra, if visibly and on the earth. *Ridley*:—I answer, that these articles were set out, I both writing and consenting to them, mine own hand will testify the same, and Master Cranmer put his hand to them likewise, and gave them to others afterwards." (Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 227.)

[2] "On Friday, the 20th of October, [1553] Weston, the prolocutor, presented to the house two bills, which had already obtained his own signature; in the one of which, treating of *the Catechism*, [of Edward VI.] that formulary was described as *pestiferous and full of heresies*—as having been foisted upon the last synod fraudulently; and, therefore, that the present synod disowned it. It was for his firm refusal to sign the document which branded a catechism that had both truth and synodal authority on its side, quite as much as for his resistance to transubstantiation and the mass, that Philpot, at the close of this convocation, was visited with the severe penalties which lighted upon his head." (Biographical Notice of Philpot in P. S. Edit., p. xiii.)

The "synodal authority," however, may be regarded, perhaps, as somewhat doubtful. (See Burnet's "Reformation," vol. ii., p. 766. Edit. Orr, 1850; and Collier's "Eccles. Hist.," vol. v., p. 506; Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 51, note; Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops," series ii., vol. ii., pp. 288, 290; Lamb's "Historical Account of Articles," p. 8; and Cardwell's "Synodalia," vol. i., pp. 4, 5.)

[3] See Preface to Whittaker's Edition, 1857.

I.

"Christ is not so altogether absent from the world, as many do suppose. For albeit the *substance of His body* be *taken up from us:* yet is His Godhead perpetually present with us. . . . Spiritual things are not to be seen, but with the eye of the Spirit. Therefore, he that in earth will see the Godhead of Christ, let him open the eyes, not of his body, but of his mind, but of his faith; and he shall see Him present, whom eye hath not seen; he shall see Him present, and in the midst of them, wheresoever be two or three gathered together in His Name, he shall see Him present with us, even unto the end of the world. What said I? Shall he see Christ present? Yea, he shall both see and feel Him dwelling within himself, in such sort as he doth his own proper soul. . . . Although He be already gone up into heaven; nevertheless by His nature of Godhead, and by His Spirit, He shall always be present in His Church, even to the end of the world. Yet this *proveth not that He is* PRESENT *among us in* HIS BODY. For His Godhead hath *one property:* His manhood *another.* His manhood was create, His Godhead uncreate. His manhood is in *some* ONE *place of Heaven:* His Godhead is in such sort eachwhere, that it filleth both heaven and earth. But to make this matter plainer, by a similitude or comparing of like to like: There is nothing that doth trulier, like a shadow, express Christ, than the sun; for it is a fit image of the light and brightness of Christ. The sun doth alway keep the heaven: yet do we say that it is present also in the world; for without light there is nothing present, that is to say, nothing to be seen of any man: for the sun with his light fulfilleth all things. So Christ is lifted up above all heavens, that He may be present with all, and fully furnish all things, as St. Paul doth say. But as touching the *bodily* presence of Christ here in earth (if it be lawful to place in comparison great things with small,) Christ's body is *present* to our *faith;* as the sun, when it is seen is present to the eye: the body whereof, although it do not bodily touch the eye, nor be presently with it together here in earth, yet is it present to the sight, notwithstanding so large a distance of space between. So Christ's body, which at His glorious going up was conveyed from us; which left the world, and is gone unto His Father: *is a great way* ABSENT FROM OUR MOUTH, *even then when we* RECEIVE WITH OUR MOUTH *the holy sacrament of His body and blood.* Yet is our faith in heaven,

and beholdeth the Sun of Righteousness; and is presently together with Him in heaven, in such sort as the sight is in heaven with the body of the sun, or in earth the sun with the sight. And as the sun is present to all things by his light: so is Christ also in His Godhead. Yet neither can from the body the light of the sun be sundered; not from His immortal body the Godhead of Christ. We must therefore so say, that Christ's body is in some one place of heaven, and His Godhead everywhere: that we neither of His Godhead *make a body:* nor of *His body* a God. . . . He could not be presently with all at once, unless His body were so turned into Godhead, that He might be in *all* or in *many places* together: as Eutyches, and certain like heretics held opinion. If it so were that He might be eachwhere present with all, at one very instant time: then were HE NOT MAN, but a *ghost:* neither should He have a TRUE *body*, but a *fantastical:* whereof should have sprung forth a thousand errors, all which He hath dispatched by carrying His body up whole to heaven." (Whittaker's Edition, pp. 16-20.)

II.

"*Master:*—What declareth and betokeneth the supper unto us, which we solemnly use in the remembrance of the Lord?"

"*Scholar:*—The supper (as I have showed a little before) is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch as the bread representeth His body, betrayed to be crucified for us, the wine standeth in stead and place of His blood, plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the body, that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life."

"*Master:*—How come these things to pass?"

"*Scholar:—These things come to pass by a certain secret mean and lively working of the Spirit, when we believe that Christ hath, once for all, given up His body and blood for us*, to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to His heavenly Father; and also when we confess and acknowledge Him our only Saviour, High Bishop, Mediator and Redeemer; to whom is due all honour and glory."

"*Master:*—All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh thy meaning is: that *faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat*, full both of salvation

and immortality, dealt among us by the means of the Holy Ghost." (Whittaker's Edition, pp. 32-33.)

III.

Nowell's Catechism.

Alexander Nowell was born about 1507. He was educated at Brasen-Nose College, Oxford, of which in 1595 he was made President.

In Queen Mary's reign he was at first among the exiles at Strassburg, and afterwards at Frankfort.

Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he became Dean of St. Paul's, and was chosen to be Prolocutor in the Convocation which revised the "Articles of Religion." He died in 1602.

The following account of his Catechism is from Bishop Jacobson's Preface to the Oxford Edition of 1835 :—

"The larger Catechism was prepared at the suggestion of Cecil, and was intended not only for the use of schools, but also to serve as a standing summary of the doctrines of the Church of England. Such a work, it was hoped, would silence an objection which was commonly urged by the Papists, particularly abroad, 'that the Protestants had no principles;' 'that nothing touching religion was with any authority or consent of any number of the learned here set forth, but that a few private persons taught and writ their opinions without any authority at all.' The time at which the Catechism was drawn up, cannot be exactly ascertained. It must have been before the opening of the session of Convocation in 1562, in the course of which the thirty-nine Articles were compiled and agreed upon; for in one paper, in which the heads of business to be transacted by that Synod are noted, it is spoken of 'as well-nigh finished by the industry of the Dean of Paule's;' in another, as 'already done, and wanting only viewing.' On being submitted to the Lower House, it was so carefully examined and corrected, that 'it was by them unanimously approved and allowed as their own book and owned doctrine.' In the course of the twenty-second session it was presented to the Upper House by the author in his capacity of Prolocutor, attended by Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, and Day, Provost of Eton. The Bishops of Salisbury, Exeter, St. David's and Lichfield, were appointed to examine the Catechism, but they seem to have contented themselves with a reiterated

assurance from the Lower House that they had unanimously approved of the book. After receiving some additions it was presented a second time to the Upper House, but, like the Book of Discipline [1] tendered to them about the same time, never received their formal sanction. From the paper containing notes of matters to be discussed in this Synod, it appears to have been originally designed to have Nowell's Catechism and Jewel's Apology added to the Articles of the Church in one book, authorized as containing true doctrine, and enjoined to be taught to the youth in the universities and grammar schools throughout the realm. That the alterations made in the Catechism during the time that it was before Convocation were considerable and extensive, we may gather from the expressions used by Nowell in a letter which he addressed to Cecil, June 22nd, 1563, which may be seen in Strype, Annals, I. i., p. 526. The dean there states, 'whereas the copy of the Catechism which he caused to be written out for his honor, came to the hands of the bishops and clergy, assembled in the late Convocation, and by reason that certain places were by their judgments altered, and that it was interlined and somewhere blotted, he had caused it to be copied out again, and had sent it to him now, not in his own name as afore, but in the name of the clergy of the Convocation, as their book, seeing it was by them approved and allowed. . . . That for his part he had taken pains, as well, about the matter of the book, that it might be consonant unto the true doctrine of the Scriptures, as also that the style might agree with the purity of the Latin tongue. And that as the book had not misliked their judgments, whom he did most allow, and also reverence, so, if it might likewise be approved to him, to whose patrociny in his purpose he appointed it when he first began it, he should think his pains most happily bestowed.' Heylin and Burnett indeed seem to have considered the alterations so numerous and so important, that it could hardly be regarded any longer as Nowell's work, but minute of Convocation to the effect that the Catechism which it was thought desirable should be set forth in Latin, was already done by the Dean of Paul's, and wanted only viewing—combined with the letter just quoted, and the details which Strype has preserved respecting the work, during the interval which elapsed between the prorogation of the Convocation on the 16th of April, 1562, and its publication in 1570,

[1] Perhaps the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum."

and the fact that the dedication bears his initials—are surely sufficient to shew that such expressions must have resulted either from carelessness or undue scepticism. The fresh transcript of the Catechism, of which Nowell speaks in his letter to Cecil, remained in the secretary's hands for above a year, and was then returned to the author, with some learned man's notes. It remained with Nowell till 1570, by which time the Horatian precept must have been fulfilled to the letter. The two archbishops then urged its publication, and with Cecil's express permission, the original dedication to him was altered into one addressed to the archbishops and bishops. . . .

"It was originally designed that the Catechism should have been employed in schools with the same uniformity as the grammar prescribed by authority. We have already seen, however, that no such sanction was actually given by the Convocation of 1562. In the canons agreed upon by Archbishop Parker and the bishops of his province, in April, 1571, its use seems to have been enjoined with all the strictness which had at first been contemplated. . . . The larger Catechism of Nowell stands first in a list of books, enjoined by a statute of the University of Oxford, made in 1578, for 'the quelling and abolishing heretical pravity.' . . . Archbishop Grindal, in the third of his statutes for the school which he founded at St. Bees, in 1583, directs, that 'the schoolmaster shall teach them the Greater as well as the Lesser Catechism, set out by authority, and no other Catechism; except publicly authorized.' The canons drawn up in 1603 are absolute in enjoining the uniform use of the grammar set forth by King Henry VIII., and direct all schoolmasters to use these Catechisms on pain of suspension."

Dr. Blakeney says:—

"In 1553, a Catechism known as Ponet's, was sanctioned by Convocation. In 1561 it was determined to improve upon it, and Dean Nowell was employed for the purpose.

"His work, commonly called 'Nowell's Catechism,' was approved by Convocation in 1562. 'But,' says Procter, 'not formally sanctioned, apparently because it was treated as part of a larger design which was not realized,'—that design being to publish in one book the Articles, Nowell's Catechism, and Jewel's Apology, with public approval." (Blakeney on Book of Common Prayer, p. 568.)

There is no question that reference is made to this Catechism in the 79th canon, which says:—

"All schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism heretofore by public authority set forth."

The following Extracts are taken from the English Translation of Norton as given in the Parker Society's Edition.

I.

"*Master:*—Tell me how this is to be understood."

"*Scholar:*—Plainly, that Christ in His body ascended into heaven, where He had not afore been in His body, and *left the earth*, where He had afore been *in His body*. For in His nature of Godhead, which filleth all things, both He ever was in heaven and also with the same, and with His Spirit, He is alway present in earth with His Church, and shall be present to the end of the world."

"*Master:*—Then thou sayest, that there is one manner of His Godhead and another of His manhood."

"*Scholar:*—Yea, forsooth, master. For we neither make of His Godhead a body, nor of His body God; for *His manhood is a creature*, His Godhead not created. And the Holy Scriptures witness that His *manhood* was *taken up into heaven* and abideth in heaven; but His Godhead is so everywhere that it filleth both heaven and earth."

"*Master:*—But dost thou say that Christ is in any wise present with us in body?"

"*Scholar:*—If we may liken great things to small, Christ's body is so present to our faith, as the sun when we see it, is present to our eye. For no one thing subject to our senses, cometh more near to the likeness of Christ than the sun, which, though it still abide in the heaven, and therefore in very deed toucheth not the eye, yet the body of the sun is present to the sight, notwithstanding so great a distance of place between. So the body of Christ, which by His ascending is taken up from us, and hath left the world, and hath gone to His Father, is indeed absent from our senses, yet our faith is conversant in heaven, and beholdeth that Sun of Righteousness, and is verily in presence with it there present, like as our sight is present with the body of the sun in the heaven, or as the sun is present with our sight in earth. Moreover, as the sun is with his light present to all things, so is also Christ, with His Godhead, Spirit and Power, present to all, and filleth all." (Pp. 162, 163.)

II.

"*Master:*—Thou conceivest well the right understanding concerning the visible signs and outward use of the sacraments. But whereas, secondly, thou givest to the sacraments the strength and efficacy to seal and confirm God's promises in our hearts, thou seemest to assign to them the proper offices of the Holy Ghost."

"*Scholar:*—To lighten and give bright clearness to men's minds and souls, and to make their consciences quiet and in security, as they be indeed, so ought they to be accounted the proper work of the Holy Ghost alone, and to be imputed to Him, and this praise not to be transferred to any other. But this is no impediment, but that God may give to His mysteries the second place in quieting and establishing our minds and consciences, but yet so that nothing be abated from the virtue of His Spirit. Wherefore we must determine that, the *outward element hath* neither OF ITSELF nor IN ITSELF inclosed the force and efficacy of the sacrament, but that the same wholly floweth from the Spirit of God, as out of a spring-head, and is by the divine mysteries, which are ordained by the Lord for this end, conveyed unto us." (Ibid. pp. 206, 207.)

III.

"*Master:*—Sith we be in the earth, and Christ's body in heaven, how can that be that thou sayest?"

"*Scholar:*—We must lift our souls and hearts from earth, and raise them up by faith to heaven, where Christ is."

"*Master:*—Sayest thou then the mean to receive the body and blood of Christ standeth upon faith?"

"*Scholar:*—Yea. For *when we believe that Christ died to deliver us from death, and that He rose again to procure us life, we are partakers of the redemption purchased by His death,* and of His life, and all other His good things; and with the same conjoining wherewith the head and the members are knit together, He coupleth us to Himself by secret and marvellous virtue of His Spirit, even so that we be members of His body, and be of His flesh and His bones, and do grow into one body with Him."

"*Master:*—Dost thou then, that this conjoining may be made, imagine the bread and wine to be changed into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ?"

"*Scholar:*—There is no need to invent any such change.

For both the Holy Scriptures, and the best and most ancient expositors, do teach that by baptism we are likewise the members of Christ, and are of His flesh and bones, and do grow into one body with Him, when yet there is no such change made in the water."

"*Master:*—Go on."

"*Scholar:*—In both the sacraments the substances of the outward things are not changed; but the word of God and heavenly grace coming to them, there is such efficacy, that as by baptism we are once regenerate in Christ, and are first, as it were, joined and grafted into His body; so when we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood, most full of health and immortality, given to us by the work of the Holy Ghost, and received of us *by faith, as the mouth of our soul,* we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life, growing together in them both into one body with Christ."

"*Master:*—Then Christ doth also otherwise than by His Supper only give Himself unto us, and knitteth us to Himself with most strait conjoining."

"*Scholar:*—Christ did then principally give Himself to us to be the author of our salvation, when He gave Himself to death for us, that we should not perish with deserved death. By the Gospel also He giveth Himself to the faithful, and plainly teacheth that He is that lively bread that came down from heaven to nourish their souls that believe in Him. And also in baptism, as is before said, Christ gave Himself to us effectually, for that He then made us Christians."

"*Master:*—And sayest thou that there are no less strait bands of conjoining in the Supper?"

"*Scholar:*—In the Lord's Supper both that communicating which I spake of is confirmed unto us, and is also increased, for that each man is both by the words and mysteries of God, ascertained that the same belongeth to himself, and that Christ is by a certain peculiar manner given to him, that he may most fully and with most near conjunction enjoy Him, insomuch that not only our souls are nourished with His holy body and blood as with their proper food, but also our bodies, for that they partake of the sacraments of eternal life, have, as it were by a pledge given them, a certain hope assured them of resurrection and immortality, that at length Christ abiding in us and we again abiding in Christ, we also, by Christ abiding in us, may obtain not only everlasting life, but also the glory

which His Father gave Him. In a sum I say thus: as I imagine not any gross joining, so I affirm that same secret and marvellous communicating of Christ's body in His Supper to be most near and strait, most assured, most true, and altogether most high and perfect."

"*Master*:—Of this that thou hast said of the Lord's Supper, meseems, I may gather that the same was not ordained to this end, that Christ's body should be offered in sacrifice to God the Father for sins."

"*Scholar*:—*It is* NOT *so offered.* For He, when He did institute His Supper, commanded us to *eat* His body, not to *offer* it. As for the prerogative of offering for sins, it pertaineth to Christ alone, as to Him which is the eternal Priest; which also when He died upon the cross, once made that only and everlasting sacrifice for our salvation, and fully performed the same for ever. For us there is nothing left to do, but to take the use and benefit of that eternal sacrifice bequeathed us by the Lord Himself, which we chiefly do in the Lord's Supper."

"*Master*:—Then I perceive the holy Supper sendeth us to the death of Christ, and to His sacrifice once done upon the cross, by which alone God is appeased toward us."

"*Scholar*:—It is most true. For by bread and wine the signs is assured unto us, that as the body of Christ was once offered a sacrifice for us to reconcile us to favour with God, and His blood once shed, to wash away the spots of our sins, so now also in His Holy Supper *both are given to the faithful*, that we surely know that the reconciliation of favour pertaineth to us, and may take and receive the fruit of the redemption purchased by His death."

"*Master*:—Are then only the faithful fed with Christ's body and blood?"

"*Scholar*:—They ONLY. For to whom He communicateth His body, to them, as I said, He communicateth also everlasting life."

"*Master*:—Why dost thou not grant that the body and blood of Christ *are included in the bread and cup*, or that the bread and wine are changed into the substance of His body and blood?"

"*Scholar*:—Because that were to bring in *doubt the* TRUTH *of Christ's body;* to do dishonour to Christ Himself; and to fill them with abhorring that receive the sacrament, if we should imagine His body either to be enclosed in so narrow a room, or to be *in many places at once*, or His flesh to be chewed

in our mouth with our teeth, and to be bitten small and eaten as other meat." (Pages 213-216.)

IV.

"*Master*:—Sith then both good and bad do indifferently and in common use the sacraments, what sure and steadfast trust of consciences can be in them, which thou even now didst affirm?"

"*Scholar*:—Though the ungodly, so much as concern themselves, *do not receive the gifts of God offered in the sacraments*, but do refuse and disappoint themselves; yet the godly, which by faith seek Christ, and His grace in them, are never disappointed or defrauded of a most good conscience of mind, and most sweet comfort, by an assured hope of salvation and of perfect felicity." (Page 218.)

IV.

Jewel's Apology.

Bishop Jewel's Apology is recognised in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as "the Apology of the Church of England," and is quoted by Hooker ("Eccl. Pol.," ii., 6) under the name of "The English Apology." Collier states, that it was approved by the Queen, and set forth with the consent of the bishops. ("Eccl. Hist.," ii., 479.) And Bishop Jewel himself, in his reply to Harding, says, that he had the concurrence of the whole English clergy, and that the book had the Queen's licence. It was first published in 1562, the very same year as our present Articles; and "by Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and chained up in all parish churches throughout England and Wales" (Watt under the name "Jewel.") And of this work and Nowell's Catechism, Bishop Randolph thus speaks in the Preface to his Enchiridion. "My choice has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the Church at large. . . . Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism, the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the bishops, and was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church, in whose name it is

written; the latter had the express sanction of Convocation. . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed."[1]

The following Extracts are taken from Lady Bacon's Translation, as given in the Parker Society's Edition:—

I.

"And, although the Majesty and Godhead of Christ be everywhere abundantly dispersed, yet we believe that *His* BODY as St. Augustine saith, 'must needs be still in ONE PLACE;' and that Christ hath given majesty unto His body, but yet hath not taken away from it the NATURE *of a body*, and what we must not so affirm Christ to be God, that we deny Him to be man; and as the martyr Vigilius saith, that 'Christ hath LEFT *us* as touching His *human nature*, but hath NOT LEFT us as touching His *divine nature*,' and that the same Christ, though He be ABSENT from us concerning His MANHOOD, yet is ever present with us concerning His Godhead." (Page 59.)

II.

"And those sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks or badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories. And we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that those be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given unto the *believing* the body and blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the supper to be the communion of the body and blood of Christ; by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, and be fed unto immortality; and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate unto Christ, that we may abide in Him, and He in us. . . . We say that Eucharistia, the Supper of the Lord, is a *sacrament*, that is to wit, *an evident*

[1] See "Goode on Eucharist," pp. 727-8, from whom this account is taken. Strype says of the Apology that it "was approved by the allowance and authority of the Queen, and published by the consent of the bishops and others. . . . It was written upon a state occasion by the common advice and consultation, no doubt, of the College of Divines that were met about Reformation of the Church." (Annals, vol. i., ch. 25, Anno 1562, pp. 284, 285, Edit. 1725. See also Heylin's "History of Reformation," E. H. S. Edit., pp. 385-387.)

token of the body and blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes, the death of Christ, and His resurrection, and what act soever He did whilst He was in His mortal body; to the end we may give Him thanks for His death, and for our deliverance; and that, by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the remembrance of that matter, to the intent we being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe that the body and blood of Christ doth in like manner feed our souls, as bread and wine doth feed our bodies. To this banquet we think the people of God ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare and testify both the godly society which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus." (Pages 62, 63.)

III.

"We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that *by faith* we verily receive His body and His blood. . . . For we affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give His own self, in His sacraments, in baptism, that we may put Him on, and in His Supper that we may eat Him *by faith and spirit*, and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but *effectually* and *truly*. For although *we do* NOT TOUCH *the* BODY *of Christ with teeth and mouth*, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him *by faith, by understanding and by the spirit*. And this is no vain *faith which doth comprehend Christ;* and that is not received with cold devotion, which is received *with understanding, with faith, and with spirit.*" (Pages 63, 64.)

IV.

"We justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the word of God, without the authority of the holy fathers, without any example of antiquity, after a new guise, do not only *set before the people* the sacramental *bread to be* WORSHIPPED as God, but do also carry the same about upon an ambling horse." (Page 64.)

V.

"It is our *faith* that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and *not the act of the* massing *priest*. 'Faith had in the sacraments,' saith Augustine, 'doth justify, and not the sacraments.' And Origen saith, 'Christ is the *priest*, the *propitiation*, and *sacrifice;* which propitiation cometh to every one *by mean of* FAITH.' So that by this reckoning, we say that the sacraments of Christ without faith do not once profit these that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead." (Pages 64, 65.)

VI.

"We affirm together with the antient fathers, that the body of Christ *is* NOT eaten *but of the* GOOD *and* FAITHFUL and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ." (Page 92.)

VII.

"These men have changed all things, contrary to Christ's institution, and have made a private mass of the holy communion. And so it cometh to pass, that WE give *the Lord's Supper* unto the people, and THEY give them a *vain pageant* to GAZE *on*." (Page 92.)

VIII.

"*Their* doctrine is, that Christ's very body effectually, and, *as they speak*, REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY, may not only be *eaten* of WICKED and UNFAITHFUL MEN, but also (which is monstrous to be spoken) of mice and dogs." (Page 92.)

V.

BULLINGER'S DECADES.

Although Henry Bullinger's name is not very often heard now, he was a very remarkable man. And though he was never in England, the thread of his life is, in part, closely interwoven with the history of the English Reformed Church, in which he took a deep interest, and which may be truly said to owe much to him.

He was born 1504, not very far from Zurich.

"In his childhood he was preserved several times from imminent perils; once from the plague and risk of premature

interment; again, when by a fall in the street a whistle which was in his hand was driven into his neck; and again, when the enticement of a beggar would have stolen him from his home and friends."

From school at Emmerich he went to the University of Cologne 1519. Here he studied diligently the ancient Fathers. Here also he met with some of the earlier writings of Luther and Melancthon. Here also days and nights spent in the study of the New Testament were followed by an opening of his mind and heart to the reception of the Gospel.

For six years after 1523 Bullinger was engaged as a teacher of monks and students in the Cistercian Convent of Cappel. Here he formed acquaintance with Zuingle and Leo Judæ and was led by the former to the entire renunciation of the Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

"In December of the same year, the senate of Zurich deputed Bullinger to accompany Zuingle to the important disputation at Berne. On his return he was prevailed on to undertake the pastoral office; and preached his first sermon on Sunday, June 21, 1528, at the village of Husen, near Cappel."

After incessant preachings and expositions in the neighbourhood of Bremgarten, in 1531 he succeeded Zuingle in the preachership of the Cathedral at Zurich.

"In this important post Bullinger continued for the remainder of his long life, labouring with most assiduous diligence and widespread influence. For several years from 1531 to 1538, his preachings were daily, sometimes twice in the day; his publications, of which many were suggested by passing events, were voluminous and frequent; his pastoral and synodical, civil and ecclesiastical engagements were unceasing and very various; his correspondence was exceedingly extensive and critical: and his house was always open, and his interpositions ready to shelter and befriend especially refugees from every country where religious persecution raged. And during the protracted efforts to effect a reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Church of Zurich on the sacramentarian question, his moderation and sincerity were eminently conspicuous."

"In his extant diary Bullinger has marked March 29, 1547, as the day when Hooper and his wife, in their exile, accomplished their long-cherished desire of visiting him; and March 24, 1549, when they left him for England with their daughter Rachel, his godchild. In the end of May of the last mentioned

year also Calvin and Farell came to Bullinger, and a consensus or agreement was completed on the subject of the Lord's Supper, between the Churches of Geneva and Zurich. At the same instant, as appeared by various decrees in the year following, the whole weight of the Papal party, imperial and ecclesiastical, was combining to condemn Bullinger and all his writings. But nothing turned him aside from his steady course of usefulness; and early in 1554 the largest influx of English refugees enjoyed his sympathy and interest. Among them were Parkhurst, Jewel, Horn, Pilkington, Lever, Humphrey and Cole. Italian exiles from Locarno also sought and obtained like shelter in Zurich, through his interventions, in the spring of the year following."

"Early in October, 1574, his last and fatal disorder attacked him. In the first instance, indeed, the severity of the seizure yielded so far to the remedies that were applied that he was able to resume his public duties. But the disease returned on the 24th of May in the year following with excruciating violence, and lasted until the 17th of September, when, after exhibiting a bright example of Christian patience, and having taken a touching personal farewell of all his colleagues, and written a letter to the Senate of Zurich, to be delivered after his decease (one object of which was to commend to them Rodolph Gualter as his successor), he expired, in the exercise of much prayer and in the peace of the gospel, in the 71st year of his age."[1]

I cannot do better than give the following account of the authoritative sanction which was given to Bullinger's Decades, in the words of Dean Goode (on Eucharist, ii., pp. 735-736).

"At the Convocation in 1586, the archbishop and bishops agreed to certain 'Orders,' of which the first was this: 'Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Art and Bachelor of Law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the 2nd day of February next, provide a Bible and Bullinger's Decads, in Latin or English, and a paper book. And shall every day read one chapter of the Holy Scriptures; and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper-book. And shall every week read over one sermon in the said Decads, and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper [book]. And shall once in every quarter . . . show his said notes to some preacher near adjoining, to be assigned for that purpose.' And by the second of

[1] See Biographical notice at the commencement of Decade V. in Parker Society's Edition.

these 'Orders,' the said preachers are to certify to the archdeacon or bishop, 'who do perform the said exercises, and how they have profited therein.' (Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, No. 32, iii., 194, 195; Oxf. ed. See also Wilkins's "Concilia," iv., 321.) Moreover, a copy of these 'Orders' was lodged with the Secretary of State in January, 1586, (1587 new style) the month after they were agreed upon by the bishops, and deposited by him in the State Paper Office (where they still remain) and endorsed, 'Orders for the Discipline of the Church.' So that, although they may not have received the formal and written authorization of the authorities of the State, they certainly were formally brought under their notice, and received their tacit sanction. And this was one of those more important documents of which Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State in the time of Charles II. had copies for greater security. And in the title page of the edition of 1587 are the words (not found in the previous editions), 'Cum gratia et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis.' And so completely were these 'Orders' considered by the archbishop to have received public sanction, that he expected that it would be inquired into in the following Parliament, how they had been observed, as he told the bishops in circular letter sent to them in November, 1588. (See Strype's Whitgift, b. iii., c. xx., p. 531; Oxf. ed. See also Cardwell's 'Synodalia,' vol. ii., p. 563.)."

The following extracts are taken from his Decades as published in four volumes by the Parker Society.

I.

"But here some move many and divers questions touching the sacramental union, whether it be personal, real, or rational. I, because I see nothing of this matter doubtfully delivered of the Apostles, and that the thing, being plain of itself, by such manner of sophistications is made dark, doubtful, difficult, and obscure; simply and plainly say, that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in the sacraments by *God's institution*, by *faithful contemplation* and *use*; to be short, in *signification* and *likeness* of the things: but I UTTERLY DENY, that those two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified is in his own substance and nature: I DENY, that the THING SIGNIFIED is *joined* corporally with the SIGN, so that the *sign* remaineth still in his own substance and nature, and yet nevertheless, in

the mean time, hath the *thing signified corporally joined unto it;* that thereby *whosoever is partaker of the sign*, should be also *by the sign or with the sign* PARTAKER *of the* THING ITSELF. The reason why I do so *constantly* DENY *that*, appeareth, I think, sufficiently by those examples which I have hitherto declared, and which hereafter shall be declared. . . . My saying is, that they are coupled together in a faithful contemplation, because they which partake the sacraments religiously do not fasten their eyes on sensible things only, but rather on things insensible, signified, and heavenly; so that the FAITHFUL have in themselves BOTH TWAIN *coupled together*, which OTHERWISE *in the sign or with the sign are knit together* with NO BOND." (Vol. iv., Dec. v., pp. 278, 279.)

II.

"After the same manner is it to be seen in the institution of the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. The bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. But since the right faith believeth, that the true body of Christ, *ascended out of this world*, liveth and *is now in heaven*, and that the Lord returneth no more into this world until He come in the clouds of heaven to judge the quick and the dead, every man understandeth, that to the sign, to wit, bread and wine, the names of the things themselves, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, are given through the communicating of names." (Ibid. p. 282.)

III.

"Christian faith doth attribute the grace of God, remission of sins, sanctification and justification, fully and wholly to the free mercy of God, and to the merit of Christ's passion; yea, in such sort doth Christian faith attribute these spiritual benefits unto it, that beside it nothing at all is admitted to take part with it. Therefore where as Lombard saith, 'That *sacraments have received power* to confer or give grace by the merit of the passion of Christ, it is of HIS OWN FORGING. For as Christ giveth not His glory to any, either saint or mortal man, much less to a creature without life; even so he that believeth to be fully justified by the death and resurrection of the Lord, seeketh no further grace and righteousness in any other thing than in Christ only, upon whom he stayeth, whom also by faith he feeleth in his heart or mind already to exercise His force by the Holy Ghost.'" (Ibid. p. 304.)

IV.

"About this matter Bonaventura hath wonderfully busied himself, who in his writing, *In* 4. *Magistri Distinct., Quæst.* 3, among other things at the length saith: 'We must not say by any means that *grace is contained* substantially in the sacraments, as water in a vessel, or as a medicine in a box; yea, to understand it so, it is erroneous. But they are said to contain grace, in that they *signify* grace; and because, unless there be a want on the part of the receiver, grace is always *given in them:* so that ye must understand that grace is *in the soul*, and *not in the visible signs.* For this cause they are called also vessels of grace. They may be also called vessels after another manner, because, as that which is in a vessel is no part of it, neither cometh of it, and yet nevertheless is drawn out of; so grace cometh *neither of nor by* the sacraments, but springeth from the eternal fountain, and is drawn out from thence by the soul in the sacraments." (Ibid. pp. 307, 308.)

V.

"But before I entreat further of the other ends of the supper, consisting in the description thereof; I will recite what other some allege of the promise and communion of Christ. They condemn our doctrine as heretical. For they contend, that the Lord promised that He would give unto the faithful His *very body and blood*, to be eaten and drunken *under the form of bread and wine;* therefore it must by all means, and without all contradiction, be believed, that the bread is the Lord's natural body, and the wine His blood; and that these ought to be eaten and drunken, not only spiritually, but also corporally, unto life everlasting. And that Christ is bodily present in the supper, and that the bread is His body and the wine His blood, thus they prove: That which the Lord speaketh cannot be false, for He is the truth itself; but He saith, that the bread is His body, and the wine His blood; therefore the bread and wine of the sacrament are verily, really, and essentially the body and blood of Christ. Which truth, they say, must simply be believed, although reason itself, the whole world, all senses, and nature itself, be against it. We answer: That indeed all things are *very true which the Lord hath spoken*, who is truth itself; but *in that sense* which He Himself said and understood, not in that meaning which we will enforce upon His words. Wherefore before all things we must search out *the true sense*

of *the Lord's words* in the supper, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood, etc.'

"These men cry out, saying, that the Lord's words ought to be expounded simply, and according to the letter; for they are the words of a testament; and that permitteth not His words to be expounded by a trope or figure. But we say, that all the evangelical and apostolical books are numbered under the title of the testament; and therefore throughout all and every place of the Scripture nothing must be corrupted, nothing added, nothing diminished, unless we will be subject to the curse of God. And yet we are also constrained to confess, that there be infinite sentences in the Holy Scriptures, which, if we will proceed to expound simply according to the letter, we shall overthrow the whole Scripture and the true faith, or we shall seem to charge the Scriptures with lies and contradiction." (Ibid. pp. 435, 436.)

VI.

"Now it is manifest, that He spake of His true sensible body when He saith, 'This is my body,' for He addeth, 'Which is broken or given for you.' But the true, natural, sensible, or human body was delivered and died for us. But this appeareth not in the bread, or under the bread. Wherefore the Lord's words must be *expounded*. . . . Neither is there any cause why they should here, as it were, cast their mists before our eyes, and apply their coloured interpretation unto a rotten construction, using words, 'UNSPEAKABLY, SUPERNATURALLY, INVISIBLY, NOT QUALITIVELY, NOT QUANTIVELY, NOT AS IN A PLACE.' For by these terms they, intending in the meanwhile to bring some other thing to pass, do by the wonderful judgment of God quite subvert and overthrow all that is their own. For if this their mystery be unspeakable, why then do they use these terms, 'ESSENTIALLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, REALLY, CORPORALLY'? For they that speak so, do utter truly and set down the manner of His presence. If the bread be *supernaturally* the body of Christ, why then do they add *naturally?* And if the bread be Christ's body invisibly, then can it not be corporally, neither can it be a TRUE BODY, whose property is to be visible. Who would not laugh, if he should hear that fire burnt and gave no heat, and that light did shine and gave no light? If he be not present in quality, quantity, and as in a place, then is He *not corporally* present. For, I pray you, are not *qualities, quantities, and place*, belonging to the *body?* Hearken what Augustine

saith unto Dardanus touching the presence of God: 'Take,' saith he, '*space of place* from *bodies*, and they shall be NOWHERE; and because they shall be nowhere, they shall *not be* AT ALL. Take the *bodies themselves* from the *qualities of bodies*, and they shall be NOWHERE; and therefore it must needs be they *cannot be* AT ALL.' Let not us therefore rob or spoil the LORD'S BODY of the *properties* thereof, and so deny the TRUTH *of* HIS BODY." (Ibid. pp. 443, 444. See also vol. iii., Dec. iv., pp. 263-267.)

VII.

"Paul saith: 'Declare the Lord's death UNTIL HE COME.' For thus we gather thereby: He whose remembrance is repeated until He come or return, He surely is not counted to be present, but is looked for to come; therefore the Lord's body which was given for us, the remembrance whereof is celebrated in the mystical supper, is NOT PRESENT, but is looked for to come." (Ibid. p. 446.)

VIII.

"These sayings of the clarified body (which is that which ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father) repugn wholly with *ubiquity* or being in *every place* and the *insensibility* of Christ's body; which notwithstanding must needs be granted, if we proceed to enforce the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's body out of the words of the supper simply understood." (Ibid. p. 447.)

IX.

"For I am FLAT AGAINST that BODILY PRESENCE of Christ *in the bread*, which the papists defend and enforce upon the Church of God." (Ibid. p. 452.)

X.

"In this present place, by a trope or allegory, he biddeth us to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ unto everlasting life. Therefore to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood is *nothing else but to* BELIEVE THAT CHRIST'S BODY WAS GIVEN FOR US AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR US, *to the remission of sins;* and consequently, that we remain in Christ, and have Christ remaining in us. For the faith, whereof we spake, is not only an imagination or thought concerning things past and exceed-

ing our capacity; but a *most certain assurance*, and a feeling of heavenly things received within us, to our great commodity. For therefore not only faith, but the virtue and force of faith, is by the Lord signified in John by the allegory both of eating and drinking. Meat passeth not into the substance of our body without delight: so also by faith, through a great desire of the spirit, we are joined with Christ, that He may live in us, and we may live in Christ, and be partakers of all His good gifts. This is the spiritual eating of Christ, who *never thought*, no, not so much as once dreamed in this place, of the *gross* and *bodily eating*, which is indeed unprofitable. But forasmuch as the whole point of the controversy consisteth in these words of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, they interpreting the same word bodily, and we spiritually, it seemeth good to be shewed that by the words of eating and drinking the Lord is meant *no other thing than* TO BELIEVE, and consequently to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in us." (Ibid. p. 458.)

XI.

"I will recite what testimonies have been always alleged in the Church, out of the Holy Scriptures concerning the two kinds of eating of Christ. Christ's body is eaten and His blood drunken spiritually; it is also eaten and drunken sacramentally. The spiritual manner is accomplished BY FAITH, whereby being united to Christ, we be made partakers of all His goodness. The sacramental manner is only performed in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The SPIRITUAL EATING IS PERPETUAL *unto* THE GODLY, because FAITH is to them *perpetual*. They communicate with Christ both *without the supper and in the supper;* and by it they do more increase and continue their new beginnings, as we have also showed before: and now, by adjoining of the holy action, all things are done more manifestly and plainly. As for the unbelievers and hypocrites, with their captain Judas, they never communicate with Christ, neither before the supper, nor in the supper, nor after the supper, inasmuch as they continue in their unbelief; but they [partake] of the Lord's sacraments to their own judgment and condemnation." (Ibid. pp. 463, 464.)

XII.

"Wherefore the *unbelievers* do *neither* EAT THE LORD'S BODY *nor* DRINK *His* BLOOD." (Ibid. p. 465.)

XIII.

"Moreover since we be priests, we must offer sacrifices worthy of our God. And we have sufficiently testified, that, after Christ our high and only priest or bishop in all ages and in all the whole world, none doth offer a satisfactory sacrifice to take away sin; for when He offered up Himself, He offered a sacrifice but once, howbeit always effectual to cleanse the sins of all. Therefore we offer unto Him thanksgiving and praise, celebrating the memory of that one only sacrifice: we offer prayers; we offer ourselves, that is to say, our bodies, a lively and a reasonable sacrifice to God together with all kind of godliness and well-doing." (Volume iii., Dec. iv., p. 291.)

XIV.

"The name of the priest seemeth to be brought into the church out of the synagogue, for otherwise ye shall not find in the New Testament the ministers of the Word of God and of churches to be called *priests*, but after that sort that all Christians are called priests by the Apostle Peter. But it appeareth that the ministers of the New Testament, for a certain *likeness* which they have with the ministers of the Old Testament, of ecclesiastical writers are called *priests*, for as they did their service in their tabernacle, so these also, after their manner and their fashion, minister to the Church of God. For otherwise the Latin word is derived of holy things: a man, I say, dedicated and consecrated unto God to do holy things. And holy things are not only sacrifices, but what things soever come under the name of religion; from which we do not exclude the laws themselves, and holy doctrine." (Volume iv., Dec. v., p. 108.)

XV.

"That the priesthood of Aaron is utterly abrogated, it is evident by the words which the apostle citeth out of David saying: 'The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech.' Christ, therefore, is the one and only high priest, having an immutable priesthood, which cannot by succession pass from Him to any other man or angel. For He now, standing at the right hand of the Father in heaven, the very true temple which was prefigured by the tabernacle and temple at Jerusalem, doth make

intercession for us, and doth all the offices of an high priest: of whom the Apostle of Christ, St. Paul, doth speak very largely in his epistle unto the Hebrews. This Christ Jesus, our high priest, hath consecrated all the faithful to be kings and priests unto Himself. And yet notwithstanding He doth ordain ministers of the Church, by doctrine and examples to instruct the Church, and to minister the Sacraments; I mean, not these old and ancient ones, but those which the Lord hath substituted instead of the old ones. What doctrine they must teach, He doth expressly declare. The mystical attire and garments of the priesthood He neither did commend to His apostles, nor leave to His Church, but took them away with all the ceremonies that are called the middle wall betwixt the Jews and Gentiles." (Volume ii., Dec. iii., pp. 262, 263.)

These extracts from Bullinger may be thought needlessly long and numerous. It is true that one—almost *any* one—extract might have sufficed to reveal Bullinger's view of the matter before us. Yet (apart from the real value of many of the quotations) it seemed desirable to show more than this: nay, it seemed important for us to see how *thoroughly pervaded* this work of Bullinger's is with principles diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."

It is to be specially noted, that the subject of the Sacraments generally, and of the Eucharist in particular, is very deeply entered into in the fifth book of Decades. It occupies a large portion of a thick volume. It is entered into carefully and with considerable minuteness. It is treated in a searching manner, and with evident reference to existing controversies, not only with Romanists but Lutherans; the force of its arguments being directed, indeed, much more against the Real Corporal Presence than against Transubstantiation. And without a considerable number of extracts it would be impossible to do anything like justice to the general character of the teaching of the book in this matter. The force of the evidence which the book brings to bear on the question before us depends very much on this.

I am not wishing to magnify the authority of Bullinger's Decades. It would be most unreasonable to fasten on the teaching of the Church of England everything contained in four considerable-sized octavo volumes. It is not intended to claim more than the *general* approval of the Reformed Church of England of the doctrines which they teach. No *obiter dicta*, no teaching by the way, no occasional expressions of opinion on

less important matters, or on matters not controverted at the time, ought fairly to be brought forward from a book so sanctioned, as having stamped on them the seal of the English Church. But clearly the case is very different with a question which was agitating and dividing Protestant Europe. The "Yea" or the "Nay" of a book so sanctioned on such a question, we can hardly doubt was meant to be the "Yea" or the "Nay" of the English Church.

One expression of opinion distinct and decided on such a point, at such a time, must needs have caused, that the Church of England should be held responsible for lending her sanction to such teaching. But if such teaching be found not in one isolated passage, but standing out as a strong and prominent feature in the book—outspoken plainly, defined distinctly, appearing clearly, and reappearing and recurring, and woven into the very texture of the work, and made to show itself in an attitude of marked opposition to, and declared condemnation of, the very doctrine before us; if these opinions of decided opposition to anything like the doctrine in question are indeed made to stand out in bold relief; if their outline is sharp and clear; if the impress is strong, and the indentation deep,—then I ask, Can the general approval of such a work indicate anything less than an acknowledgment that the doctrine thus taught on a question so hotly contested is, as a whole, that which the Church of England desires to teach? that on the question of the Eucharistic Presence its "Yea" is her "Yea," and its "Nay" is her "Nay"?

Let me make bold to ask (in no unkindly or irreverent spirit) any one of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, whether if the fourth volume of Bullinger's Decades were to have fallen into his hands without his knowing what it was, he would not have felt at once that the book was one which he could never desire to recommend, but one which he *would* desire seriously to caution anyone against, and that with the expression of strong disapproval, marking it with the stigma of very dangerous tendencies?

Has any strictly Lutheran Communion—any Communion maintaining a Real Corporal Presence—ever lent such a sanction as our Church lent to Bullinger's Decades? Would any Lutheran Communion ever think of so doing? If a strictly Lutheran Church *were* so to do, would it not be felt, by so doing, *ipso facto,* to be un-Lutheranizing herself? Then, in fairness, how are we to refuse the acknowledgment that our Church, so

far as she has authorized Bullinger's Decades, has given authority to a denial of "The Real Objective Presence"?

In estimating the value of the testimony derived from these works, which have at certain times received sanction in the English Reformed Church, the Reader must be asked to observe (1) how completely they cover the whole Reformation Period. (2) How VERY DISTINCTLY they speak against any such view of the Eucharistic doctrine as that which is known by the name "Real Objective Presence." (3) That, however the sanction or quasi-authority, given to all or some of these books, may be regarded as having a temporary, rather than a permanent character, there is nothing in this to deduct from the value of their evidence as to our Church's views on this question, unless it can be shown that our Church has since changed her mind, and has desired clearly to *unsay* that, to the *saying* of which she has here, so far, given her sanction.

No. V.

THE HOMILIES.

We have to enter now on the examination of a work which has a considerably higher claim on our attention than any which have occupied us hitherto. The two books of Homilies have a limited, but yet a marked and abiding authority [1] given them by the statement of our Article xxxv., "The Second Book of Homilies . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, . . . as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth." We have therefore reserved the Homilies to be entered upon *next, before* the examination of our authorized Formularies.

In the first Book of Homilies there is no Homily, in the second Book there is one Homily, on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Our appeal to that Homily will be a very simple, and, I think, a very satisfactory process. Not so simple a task will it be, to clear away first an obstacle which bars the way; because it involves the necessity of entering, to some extent, on collateral questions which have been introduced into the discussion. For at the end of the First Book of Homilies there stands a notice concerning the Second Book *then to be* issued. And this notice contains an expression, which is laid hold upon, by the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence, as a phrase necessarily teaching their doctrine, and as deliberately inserted and retained by the Church of England.

The notice is this—"Hereafter shall follow sermons . . . of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, *under the form of bread and wine*."

That we may be able therefore to enter on an unprejudiced

[1] Limited, no doubt, (as in reason, for two books of such size, it must be,) by the expression, "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times." (See Stillingfleet, quoted by Abp. Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. xiii., pp. 8, 9.)

view of the teaching of our Homily itself, it will be necessary for us first to deal with the objection which lies at the threshold; one which our opponents seem to regard as of the highest importance; and one, against the removal of which they seem to have concentrated their strength. This objection appears to be [1] the chiefest of their strongholds, and one from which they seem to think, it must be impossible for them to be driven.

It is this importance attached to the matter by those who differ from us, which makes it necessary to occupy some space in dealing with it, and calls for the request that my readers will give careful attention to a question which might otherwise appear trivial.

My plan will be to aim at shewing three things :—

1st. That it is like straining at a gnat, to attempt to fasten any doctrine, as the doctrine of the Church of England, on words standing *where* and *as* this expression stands.

2ndly. That even if these words were in the highest degree authoritative, there is nothing really in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

3rdly. That, therefore, the way is quite clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that IT may bear witness, as to what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question.

I. I am to show that the position and relation of the words is such that it is like straining at a gnat to fasten on them any doctrine as the doctrine of the Church of England.

[1] "The first 160 pages of Dr. Pusey's work (*i.e.*, "The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church"), and nine of the Appendix, are spent upon a discussion of the meaning of the Advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies. . . . And nothing, I think, can more clearly show the extremities to which Dr. Pusey is driven for the defence of his cause, than that certain words in a mere *Advertisement*, inserted in 1547 (before any of our reformed Formularies had been drawn up), at the end of the First Book of Homilies, should be one of the chief authorities on which he depends to prove his doctrine to be the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. . . . On this point the only argument I can find in these 160 pages is, that if there had been a change of view in our Ecclesiastical authorities, such that these words no longer expressed their doctrine, they would not have been allowed to remain at the end of the First Book of Homilies. Now, to say nothing of the absurdity of elevating a mere *Notice* of this kind to the position of an authoritative dogmatic declaration, Dr. Pusey has himself admitted a fact which overturns this argument. For he tells us that Cranmer, though holding, and intending to express by this *Advertisement*, the doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine, afterwards went over to the Swiss School (pp. 10, 11). Did, then, Cranmer expunge the *Advertisement* after this change of view? No. What, then, is the necessary conclusion that follows? Clearly that this Advertisement was not regarded as a statement of any authority in our Church." ("Goode on Eucharist," Supplement, pp. 20-22.)

Let me endeavour to lead to a fair view of this matter by help of an illustration.

Supposing I had once held the doctrine of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, and while thus holding, I put forth a volume of sermons, and on the last page had printed a notice, declaring my intention of writing hereafter another volume, in which I purposed to treat among other matters "of the due receiving of the blessed body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine," (expressing myself in language common among Romanists and not unused by Lutherans). And supposing, that in after years, by further consideration and conference with friends, I had quite come over to the reformed views on the Eucharist, and now with these changed opinions I wrote as I intended on the subject, in a sermon expressive of my views, putting forth my new volume containing the promised sermon on the Eucharist, not with the title by which it was promised, but with the heading, "On the worthy receiving of the Sacrament." And suppose further, that now requiring a curate and anxious to secure one of my own way of thinking, I were to put into his hands my two volumes of sermons, asking him to declare his general adhesion to the views therein expressed—should I expect—would any one expect, that such a person, having read through and examined both volumes, would say to himself thus, "The views which I am expected to assent to are clearly those of the Real Corporal Presence, for though the second volume contains a sermon on the Lord's Supper, the teaching of which is certainly opposed to it, and shews that the writer's views are now the views of the Reformed, yet the first volume, which was written, I know, when the writer was either a Papist on this subject, or in a sort of transition state, has appended to it a notice of this sermon as forthcoming; and there it has given to it a title, which indicates views of a different character"?

I have no fear as to what the answer of an unprejudiced reader will be. I am sure THIS *would* be regarded as straining at a gnat indeed.

But then are the cases parallel? Sufficiently parallel, I think, for our purpose. For—

First.—At the date of the putting forth of the First Book of Homilies (early in Edward's reign, A.D. 1547), the Church of England was in a transition state as to matters of doctrine. The Reformation effected in Henry VIII.'s reign may be

spoken of as political, rather than doctrinal,[1] or, at least (for the matter of doctrine), incipient and preparatory, rather than actual or attained.

In the early part of King Edward's reign, when the First Book of Homilies went forth, the reforming party, with Cranmer at their head, had by no means thoroughly separated themselves, either from the *party*[2] which adhered to the teaching of the Church of Rome, or from the *doctrines* which we now regard as the doctrines of the Church of Rome. One of the Homilies in that Book (very unexceptionable indeed in its teaching) came from the pen of Bonner.[3] And Cranmer[4] at that time held either the Romish or the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper.

We know that two years after this, before the publication of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1549, there was a long and earnest dispute among the bishops,[5] whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected.[6]

[1] It will, I trust, be understood, that the extracts from Tyndale's Writings, in Paper No. II., were given with a view of shewing that the doctrine of the Corporal Presence was not held, at an earlier period, by *some* of those whose names are usually classed among the pioneers of the English Reformation. On Tyndale's character and work, and his relation to the English Reformation, the reader may be glad to be referred to Westcott's "General View of the History of the English Bible" (Macmillan), pp. 29-70, 173-211; and Appendix.

[2] "Cranmer communicated it [*i.e.* the First Book of Homilies] to Gardiner, and would fain have gained his approbation of it; but he was so inflamed at being left out of the King's will, that he constantly opposed all innovation till the King should be of age." (Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 32.)

[3] That is, the Homily "Of Charity." (See Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops," vol. ii., New Series, p. 212.)

[4] Dean Goode considers that Cranmer at this date held *transubstantiation.* (See "On Eucharist," i., p. 47.) Dr. Pusey, on the other side, argues from Cranmer's words that he had *for many years* ceased to believe in transubstantiation, and now held the Lutheran doctrine. (See "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 19, sqq.)

Dean Hook says, "The date of the Archbishop's renunciation of the dogma of transubstantiation is doubtful," but "in 1546 he had not given up the dogma." ("Lives of Archbishops," vol. ii., New Series, pp. 155-209. See also pp. 216, 260, 261, 263, Notes; "Hardwick's Reformation," p. 225; "Soames's Reformation," vol. iii., pp. 177, 178.)

Bishop Harold Browne thinks Cranmer held transubstantiation throughout the reign of Henry VIII., and that "most probably there may have been some gradual progress in his convictions." ("On Articles," pp. 704, 705.) The question does not seem to be material.

[5] Probably (as Dr. Pusey thinks) between the reforming bishops, and the bishops who adhered to the old learning. Whether it were so or not, the dispute is evidence of the then transitional state of the English Church.

[6] See Dryander's Letter to Bullinger in Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., vol. i., p. 351, and "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 47; also Pusey's "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 17.

And Secondly—When the Second Book of Homilies came out in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, not only does the Homily on the Lord's Supper teach (as will be seen presently) the anti-Lutheran doctrine, but while the other Homilies (for the most part) have the same titles, or nearly the same, as those by which they were advertised or promised in the notice appended to the First Book; in the case of *this* Homily, it is observable that the title is changed. And not only so—but it is specially to be marked that the article which establishes the authority of the Homilies, does in the case of the Second Book, what it does not in the case of the First—that is, it inserts[1] a list of their titles. And in the Article, the title of the Homily in question is *not* in the doubtful or objectionable language in which it was promised at the end of the First: but is the altered and amended title by which it is headed in the Second. In other words, the Article knows no Homily with any such title as "Of the due receiving of Christ's blessed Body and Blood, under the form of Bread and Wine." But it sets down the title of the Homily in question as "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ"; while in the "Table of Homilies ensuing," which stands at the commencement of the Second Book, it is named simply "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament"; and the heading which stands before the Homily itself is, "An Homily of the worthy receiving, and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

I submit, therefore, that words in such a position (appended to the First Book of Homilies), and in such a relation[2] (to the Second Book of Homilies containing the Homily promised)

[1] The words of the Article are "The Second Book of Homilies, the SEVERAL TITLES *whereof* we have joined under this Article." This insertion of the *titles* is observable. Hardwick says (of 1563) "The thirty-fourth was made to specify the titles of the Homilies (with the exception of that against Rebellion, which was published afterwards)." (On Articles, p. 129.) By this specification of titles, the answer of the Article was clearly given to any question which might arise such as this, "What is the true title of this Homily? Is it that by which it was promised in the notice, or that by which it is headed in the Second Book?" The Article which gives authority to the Homilies recognises each Homily by ONE TITLE ONLY. That one title it specifies, and, in the case of the Homily before us, it is not the title "of the due receiving of His blessed body and blood, under the form of Bread and Wine," which title the Article gives no sanction to; but it is the title "of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

[2] The expression is sometimes quoted, as from "The Book of Homilies." But certainly it forms no part of any of the Homilies. By Mr. Machonochie (Address, Jan., 1867, p 5) it is cited as from the "Title to Second Book of Homilies." But it would surely have been more correct to style it "The Rejected Title of one of the Homilies in the Second Book."

cannot have fastened on them any doctrine taught by the Church of England.

II. But I contend, secondly, that even if these words carried with them the highest symbolical authority, there is actually nothing in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

I am quite aware that in maintaining this, I am maintaining what to most people will seem paradoxical. Yet, not the less do I hope to maintain and establish it.

It is quite true that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was, in England at least, almost given up to the Romanists.

It is true, also, that this phrase (as connected with *the Presence*) "being under the forms of bread and wine" was most emphatically repudiated by Cranmer, and repudiated by him on behalf of the English Church and her Prayer Book. For when Gardiner (perhaps having in his mind the very notice before us) alleged that they who teach that "Christ is in the bread and wine" "agree in form of teaching with that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the holy communion, in that it is there said, *the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine.*" (In Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 51,)—the answer of Cranmer (and it is an answer to be carefully observed) was this: "As concerning the form of doctrine used in this Church of England in the Holy Communion, that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine, when you shall show *the place where* THIS FORM OF WORDS IS EXPRESSED, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a PLAIN UNTRUTH." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 53.)

Cranmer, therefore, I repeat, on behalf of our Formularies (in the moulding of which his influence was supreme) repudiated a phrase which implied *presence* "under the form of bread and wine." [1] And it seems to me clear, that in these words of

[1] I quote the following words of Dean Goode because they seem clearly and forcibly to express the common sense view of the case. "If the Advertisement at the end of the First Book of Homilies had been of any authority as an exponent of the doctrine of the Church of England, and been, as Dr. Pusey asserts, without the slightest authority, a statement in which Cranmer himself had 'embodied' his belief in the doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine, could he have used these words to Gardiner? If the form of words in question occurred in any formulary of authority in our Church, that was equivalent to their being in the 'Communion Book.' But Cranmer evidently repudiates the phrase altogether as one used by the Church of England. In fact it is obvious, that a mere announcement at the end of an authoritative Formulary, that the authorities of the Church intend at some future

Cranmer must be a repudiation also of all authority for the notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, if the words contained in that notice are to be held as implying anything equivalent to "the presence of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine." Anyhow, the thing specially to be noticed is this, that when Gardiner (by some mistake or other) asserted just what our modern Ritualists assert now—that the Church of England stands committed to a form of words equivalent to a statement of the *presence* or *being* of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine; the assertion was met by a counter assertion (containing a most distinct denial) from one, who above all others was competent to make it.

But I must be allowed to contend that "*to be* RECEIVED under the form of bread and wine" is not equivalent to *being under* or *being* PRESENT *under* the form of bread and wine," that the receiving under the form of bread and wine implies, of necessity, no "being" or "being present" under these forms—except it be (in the language of our Reformers) only *sacramentally* or *symbolically*, that is NOT REALLY, but *representatively;* and that the objections which might lie against the one form of expression, do not necessarily lie against the other. Does not the receiving of one thing under the form of another thing rather imply the absence than the presence of the thing received? Many things are continually being *conveyed* and *received* under the forms of papers signed and parchments sealed, which certainly are *never present* under the forms of the paper or parchment.

And as a mere matter of fact, I will cite instances to show that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was not regarded by the Reformers as, of necessity, implying a doctrine which they rejected; but was sometimes (though rarely) used or allowed (by divines most distinctly opposed to the Corporal Presence), sometimes in language speaking of *giving* or *receiving* the "Res sacramenti" *under these forms*, (or the like), and sometimes even in language speaking of the *being* or *being present* of the "Res sacramenti," (NOT REALLY, but *sacramentally* or *symbolically*) under these forms.

time to publish, of doctrine on a particular subject, can bind nobody, even at the time when it is put forth. That it may be some indication of the views entertained *at the time* by the person who inserted it, is of course readily granted. But beyond that it *cannot have the slightest force or value.*" (On Eucharist, Supplement, pp. 22-3.)

(1) I will appeal, first, to the testimony of Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," which may be said to possess (in some sense, and in some degree) the sanction [1] of the English Church.

Among the serious accusations brought against Foxe, no one, I believe, has ever charged him with holding or teaching "the Real Objective Presence"; nor is anyone, I think, very likely so to do. Yet Foxe certainly held that such a form of expression as that in the notice before us, was capable of a very sound interpretation, provided only that it be so understood (as indeed the Ritualists profess to understand it) as not to exclude the material substance of the elements. With such explanation, Foxe would acknowledge the giving and receiving, and (in a *sacramental* sense) even the *presence* of the "*res sacramenti*" *under the form of bread and wine* "to the inward eye of faith, and mouth of the soul."

His testimony on this point is so very clear and decisive, and so completely covers and shelters [2] with his approval the

[1] It was dedicated to the Queen, and was in such high estimation that it was ordered to be set up in the Churches. It is said that Queen Elizabeth had a particular esteem for the author. See Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 124.

"Quivis archiepiscopus et episcopus habebit domi suæ sacra Biblia in amplissimo volumine, uti nuperrime Londini excusa sunt, et *plenam illam historiam, quæ inscribitur* 'MONUMENTA MARTYRUM,' et alios quosdam similes libros ad religionem appositos. Locentur autem isti libri vel in aula, vel in grandi cænaculo, ut et ipsorum famulis et advenis usui esse possint." "*Eosdem illos libros*, quos proxime diximus, decanus quisque curabit emi, et locari in ecclesiâ sua cathedrali ejusmodi in loco, ut a vicariis et minoribus canonicis, et ministris ecclesiæ et ab advenis, et peregrinis commode audiri et legi possint. *Eosdem libros* illos decanus et primarius quisque residentiarius, quos appellant ecclesiæ dignitates, ement suo quisque famulitio, eosque opportuno aliquo in loco, vel in aula, vel in cænaculo locabunt." (Canons of 1571. Cardwell's Synodalia, p. 115.) "Quivis archidiaconus habebit domi suæ et alios libros et nominatim eos, qui inscribuntur MONUMENTA MARTYRUM." (Ibid. p. 117.)

Strype says of these Canons that in the framing of them, "the Archbishop [Parker], and the bishops of Ely and Winton, had the main hand: but all the bishops of both provinces in synod, in their own persons or by proxy, signed it; but not the Lower House. And the Archbishop laboured to get the Queen's allowance to it, but had it not: she often declining to give her license to their orders and constitutions, reckoning that her bishops' power and jurisdiction alone, having their authority derived from her, was sufficient." (See Strype's Parker, book iv., chap. v., p. 322; Edit. 1711.) There is no doubt that the Canons were reviewed by the Queen. (See Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i., pp. 113, 114, note.)

[2] The extract given does, indeed, so completely shelter and cover (and more than shelter and cover) the expression in the Notice, that some, to whom it has been shown, have even desired to have evidence brought forward that Foxe himself did not hold the Real Objective Presence. And the opinion has been expressed that, without such evidence, the extract may be regarded as giving strength and support to the Ritualists. The following quotations, therefore, are given to satisfy any who may be in doubt as to Foxe's views. "They [the papists] consider not the nature of a sacrament; which is, NOT *to exhibit* the thing in deed which it doth *represent*, but to REPRESENT *effectually* ONE THING by *another*: for that is the property of a

expression in the notice, that I think it worth while to give rather a long quotation at length.

In the Act of the "Six Articles," the first Article is this, "That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is *present, really under the form of bread and wine*, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived

sacrament to bear a *similitude* of one thing by *another thing;* of the which *two things* the *one* is *represented*, the *other*, indeed, *exhibited*. . . . They consider not the operation of faith, which, penetrating up *to heaven*, THERE *apprehendeth* the REAL BODY of Christ, no less, yea, and more effectually, than if he were here bodily present to the eye. . . . They seem either not to weigh the operation of Christ's passion enough, or else not to feel the heavy torment of sin and miserable hunger of man's soul; which, if they did feel, they would easily perceive what a necessary and opportune nourishment to man's conscience were the body of Christ on the cross broken, and his blood shed." (Edit. Seeley, vol. vi., pp. 521, 522.)

"So was the body of Christ once present here on earth with us, and shall be again at the day of his coming. Otherwise it is *not here really present*, but ONLY to our *faith*, *really*, that is to say, *truly*, *apprehending his body* IN HEAVEN, and here feeding upon the same in earth. And thus he is *present* ONLY *to good men*, whether *with* the symbols or *without* the symbols." (Ibid. p. 523.)

"The body of Christ is *really eaten*. *Really*, NOT with our *bodily mouth*, but with the *mouth of* FAITH; apprehending the real body of Christ, who suffered for us, and worketh to us nourishment of life and grace," etc. (Ibid. p. 523.)

"Spiritually we say his body to be present, when either the body of Christ is present to our *spirit and faith;* or when the *virtue* of his body is present and redoundeth to our bodies and spirits by grace." (Ibid. p. 523.)

"Sacramentally we eat with our bodily mouth the mysteries of bread and wine, NOT *being the real body*, indeed, but *representing* the *real body*, indeed; *i.e.*, 'Non panem Dominum sed panem Domini.'" (Ibid. p. 524.)

"The sacrament, as it is not the real body itself of the Lord, so it *causeth not* itself any *real conjunction* betwixt Christ's real body and ours, but *representeth* the same; declaring that as the material bread, digested in our bodies, is united to the same, so the body of Christ, being received by faith, changeth our spirits and bodies to the nature of him." (Ibid. p. 524.)

"The operation of the sacraments is thought by the papists to give grace, which, in very deed, *give not grace* of their own work; but only serve as instruments and means of that grace and life which cometh from God." (Ibid. p. 525.)

"No promise made to bread and wine as they be common bread and wine: but as they be sanctified and made sacraments of the Lord's body and blood, they are not now called bread and wine, but have a *promise annexed to them*, or RATHER (*to say the truth*) annexed to the RECEIVERS *of them*." (Vol. vi., p. 494, note 2.)

Those who may require further satisfaction on this subject, may be referred to the whole of Foxe's "Observations on Censures," vol. vi., pp. 520-525.

It may be observed that in the midst of this teaching, so clearly contradictory of the "Real Objective Presence," Foxe still speaks of "sacramental manducation of Christ's body, UNDER, and *with*, *the elements* of bread and wine" (p. 522); and that not far before (p. 512), he gives a note on Harpsfield's words, "His presence with the Spirit UNDER THE FORMS whereby it is given." And the note is this:—"'*Under the forms*,' that is, under the *properties* of bread and wine: and *so* ALL THIS IS TRUE."

Foxe's observations on the Eucharistic Controversy with the Lutherans will be found in vol. iv., pp. 317, 318; and vol. v., pp. 9-11.

of the Virgin Mary; and that after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, or any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man."

On this article Foxe writes:—

"We will . . . make a little stay in our story, and examine this aforesaid article by true antiquity and the course of histories; to try whether it be a doctrine new or old.

"Now therefore, for the better discussing of the matter, let us first orderly and distinctly advise the *words* of the articles; the contents of which article consist of two parts or members. In the first thereof is noted to us a *presence* of a thing there was not before: in the second, is noted a *privation* or *absence* of a thing which there was before present.

"The presence is noted by these words of the article, where it is said that in the blessed sacrament, by the words pronounced, are present the natural body and blood of our Saviour *under the forms of bread and wine*, so that in these words, both the sacrament and the natural body are imported necessarily to be present. For else, how can a natural body of Christ be present in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine, if the sacrament there were not present itself? or how can a thing be said to be in that which is not there? Wherefore by these words both the sacrament, and also the body, must necessarily have their being and presence, the one being in the other. And this presence, both of the sacrament and of the body, being rightly taken, *may right well stand together;* the sacrament to the outward eyes and mouth of man, the body of Christ to the inward eyes of faith, and mouth of the soul. And therefore touching these propositions in the article, 'in' and 'under,' if the question be asked, In what is the body of Christ? it may be well answered, In the sacrament, to the eyes of faith: like as the outward sacrament is also present to the outward eyes of the body. Again, if the question be asked, UNDER WHAT IS THE BODY OF CHRIST? it may be well *answered*, UNDER THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE, so as the doctors did *take the forms to mean* the *outward elements and natures* of the sacrament, and not the accidents.

"And thus, to the *first part* of the *article*, being WELL EXPOUNDED,[1] we *do* ASSENT and CONFESS *the same* to have been

[1] No doubt Foxe's words quoted above *require* a favourable construction. So, also, it is granted, do the words of the notice. But it is clear that Foxe's words *admit* of a favourable construction. And if so, *much more* do the words of the

the TRUE CATHOLIC OPINION, *approved by the ancient doctors* and CONSENT OF ALL TIMES, even *from the* FIRST INSTITUTION

notice. But the argument of the Ritualists depends entirely on the assumption that the words CANNOT *possibly admit* of any other construction than their own.

That Foxe's language, standing alone, would be very open to misinterpretation is willingly granted : much more so than the words of the notice. So would my saying "There is a large sum of money under this paper," if there was nothing REALLY *under* it at all. Not so, however, if I were desiring to explain to another the nature of a transaction he had witnessed, and were to say to him, "You have seen here, *under these forms*, the conveyance of an estate, and of its purchase money. If you ask, 'Under what was the estate?' I answer, 'Under the form of that parchment sealed.' If you ask, 'Under what was the money paid?' I answer, 'Under that cheque which you saw signed.'" There would be no room for misunderstanding the expression here. And quite as little room is there for misunderstanding Foxe's words after reading the quotations in the previous note. Foxe's words can be intended by him to convey but one sense, and that sense certainly not the sense which the argument of the Ritualists *actually requires* them to convey.

Our Reformers, as we have seen, regard the outward signs or elements as really offering to us; and to the believing receiver, really communicating that which they signify and represent. Therefore (after the manner of the ancient Fathers) they allow the *sign* to bear the name of the *thing signified*,—the *sacramentum* to bear the name of the *res sacramenti*. And, according to this use of language, they speak of the *presence*, and the reception of the *res sacramenti* wherever the *sign* or *sacrament* is *present*, and is *received*. Hence the distinction between the *sacramental* presence and reception of the *res sacramenti*, (which is the presence only of the *sign* or *sacrament* which bears its name,) and its *real* presence, or *real* reception, (which is the presence or reception of the very *res sacramenti* itself).

According to the same use of language the *res sacramenti* may always be said to be *under the sacramentum* or sign which represents it, NOT REALLY, but sacramentally, symbolically, figuratively, representatively, yet in the ministration REALLY *present*, (because truly and effectually communicated) "to the inward eye of faith and mouth of the soul." It is, plainly, in this sense only that Foxe speaks of Christ's Body as being "under the forms of bread and wine." And this sense of Foxe's words will be found abundantly confirmed and illustrated by the quotations which follow in the text.

But while adducing Foxe's testimony that such language was regarded as defensible and allowable on the principles of our Reformers, and is, therefore, capable of a favourable construction, still, on the principles of the English Reformation, I must be allowed to guard myself from seeming to intimate that such language is desirable *now*, or to be approved, except it be used with great caution, and due care that it be not misunderstood. That such caution should be needed is owing, indeed, I conceive, not to any error in the words, but to the error of doctrine which has grown upon them, and which now claims them as its own. That claim we do not admit. But since it is made and maintained so tenaciously, we are bound, if we use such words, to see that such doctrine is not allowed to cling to them, or be conveyed by them.

If, however, such like expressions were used in a *sacramental* (NOT REAL) sense, (and so explained) by some of the ancient Fathers, and if the error of the Church of Rome consists in imputing to them a *real* (NOT *sacramental*) sense, and so fastening upon them a doctrine which our Reformers learnt to reject;—then it was, indeed, only natural and right for our Reformers to be very cautious in using such expressions themselves, and to require them to be "well expounded"; but it obviously did not follow that they were bound absolutely to reject and renounce them altogether. Rather, I think we may say, they were bound to maintain (as, I think, it will be seen they did maintain) that they were quite capable of being understood in a sense which involved no such doctrine as the "Real Presence" taught by

of this sacrament." (Acts and Monuments, A.D. 1540, in Seeley's Edition of 1838, vol. v., p. 266.)[1]

If it be alleged that Foxe is to be regarded as a historian rather than a theologian, it may be said in reply, that, at any rate, he was certainly not unversed in the Eucharistic controversy, nor in the language which belonged to it.

Clearly John Foxe and the Church of England stand together at the same bar. The evidence against the Church of England at most amounts to but this, that she had given approval (supposing this proved) to an expression which has been thought to sound in favour of a Corporal Presence, and that having uttered it, she afterwards corrected it. The evidence against John Foxe amounts to this, that he has given a deliberate and undoubted approval of (may be said, indeed, to have stood up in defence of) a very similar, but more objectionable form of expression.

If Foxe is to be found guilty, upon the evidence, of holding and maintaining and teaching, the "Real Objective Presence," the Church of England may perhaps come under the same condemnation. But if Foxe must be acquitted, because none will accuse, and none will condemn him; then certainly the Church of England must be acquitted also. In other words, it must

Romanists and Lutherans. On the use of such sacramental language, *excluding* REALITY from the *representative* presence to which it is applied, see Paper II., pp. 60-62; and note there.

Perhaps after all, some may think the true construction of Foxe's words to be forced, and, therefore, may prefer to regard Foxe's language (*after the growth of false doctrine*) as lax and incautious—as needing an apology, and scarcely defensible—as language which he would have done well to correct. But, then let it be remembered that this is a subject on which language may fairly be allowed to claim some *specially* favourable construction; at least, when other testing passages are found, sufficient to determine and limit the sense. And then, let it be asked—might not the Church of England, under the circumstances, be allowed one somewhat loose expression, and have credit given her for subsequently correcting it?

One thing at any rate is perfectly clear,—that, whether we may consider it loose language or not, such language *could* be used, and *was* used, at the period of the Reformation, by those who did not hold the Real Objective Presence. And this is all that would be needed to make void the arguments which have been built on this expression in the notice, *even if* the words of the notice were the same as the words of Foxe. But, in truth, they are *very far, indeed*, from being the same. There is a *very wide difference* between language which speaks of "*receiving* under the forms," and "*being* under the forms." And the one, it will be allowed, much more readily admits of a favourable construction than the other. Or, in other words, it is very much more natural to give the sense of the Reformed to the words of the notice, than to the words of Foxe.

I can well understand that the language of Foxe may be thought highly objectionable now. But I cannot see that the language of the notice is fairly open to any other objection than that of being capable of misconstruction, and having been commonly used to express the doctrine of the Papists.

[1] See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 866.

be allowed that the expression in the notice before us is no evidence whatever of Lutheran doctrine.

Those who would argue from this expression, that the Church of England must needs intend to teach the doctrine now, by these words, taught by the Ritualists, and that therefore *we* must altogether change our views of our Church's teaching—must themselves, I think, first be prepared altogether to alter their own views of the hitherto despised martyrologist: they must be prepared to claim him as their own, to take him as one of themselves, and to maintain that John Foxe was at least a Lutheran in the matter of the Lord's Supper. If they are not prepared to do this, there is no other alternative, but to acknowledge (and I feel sure it *will* be acknowledged) that it is quite possible to speak as this notice speaks, and yet to have no thought of teaching any such Eucharistic doctrine, as is now assumed to be inseparable from the words.

(2) Next I must direct special attention to what was said by Ridley, when, in his disputation at Oxford, he had to deal with the proposition that "In the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of God's word spoken by the priest, the natural body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and His natural blood, are really *present under the forms of bread and wine*."[1] Ridley complains

[1] If the evidence from his writings, adduced in Paper No. II., could leave any doubt remaining as to Ridley's real views—then those who, maintaining the Real Objective Presence, have claimed Ridley on their side, might be asked—

(1) To observe, that here is a proposition submitted to Ridley, couched in the very terms which they seem to delight in, as most naturally and accurately expressing their views of the Eucharistic Presence.

(2) To consider, how very simple a thing it would have been for Ridley (if he had held their doctrine) to have assented at once to this proposition in its natural sense, instead of gratuitously allowing himself to be burnt for denying it (for the denial of *this* was the *primary* charge on which he was condemned). (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 286); and not only that, but laying (Ibid. p. 409) the guilt of his blood (which, upon this hypothesis, should rather have been upon his own head) at the door of those who condemned him for not holding a doctrine, which (upon this hypothesis) he really did hold and did actually express in his disputation—only that he chose to express it by way of a long and tangled discussion, instead of by way of one simple word of assent to a proposition which (upon this hypothesis) should have at once commended itself to his acceptance without one word of explanation or deduction.

If all this is still insufficient, let those who claim Ridley and throw overboard Cranmer (as Dr. Pusey: see "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," pp. 34-36; and "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," pp. 11 and 159), be asked to consider not only that Cranmer owed his change of views to Ridley, and knew no difference between his own doctrine and Ridley's; but that Ridley had evidently well studied Cranmer's book, and was prepared to stand by it, and would have counted it "*glory*" to have written it. (See Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., pp. 160, 161.) If all this fails to convince, add his approval of Edward the Sixth's Catechism, and Bradford's Sermons. (See Papers No. II. and IV.)

that the proposition is "very obscure and dark, by means of sundry words of doubtful signification."[1] And while repudiating the proposition as "false and erroneous" in "the sense which the schoolmen teach," he goes on to point out its ambiguities. Among others (pertaining to the earlier part of the proposition, with which we are not here concerned) he numbers the word "*really*" (*really present*), granting in one sense "Christ's body to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper:" and also "these words, *under the forms of bread and wine*," *in which* he says, "there is a further *doubtfulness* . . . whether the *forms* be there taken to signify the only accidental and outward *shews* of bread and wine; or therewithal the substantial natures thereof, which are to be seen by their qualities, and perceived by exterior senses."

And going on to condemn the Romish sense (which takes away the substances) as *false* and *erroneous*, and as a *detestable* heresy; he seems to imply that the expression "under the forms of bread and wine" (when so understood as to *include* "the substantial natures thereof") was quite capable of being so explained as not to convey a false or erroneous sense.

Indeed, I think, putting Ridley's words here beside his other sayings, it is clear that with the addition of the word "*sacramentally*" (which will be equivalent to Bishop Bilson's συμβολικῶς to be quoted presently, and which means, as we have seen, "*not* really"), Ridley would have had no hesitation in allowing the phrase "present under the form of bread and wine" as not incapable of bearing a meaning which he would have approved.

He evidently seems to mean that in the sense in which he knows the doctrinal statement to be proposed to him, he could by no means accept it; but yet that the terms of the statement were capable of being so emptied of that sense as to contain nothing more than he could approve; and that, under protestation of excluding such other sense, he would not feel himself bound altogether to refuse the very words of the proposition submitted to him. Much more then, I think, would Ridley have allowed the phrase "*received* under the form of bread and wine," as quite capable of being understood in a sound and anti-Lutheran sense.

It appears to me (and I incline to think that all who study Ridley's words attentively will come to the same conclusion)

[1] See Ridley's Works, p. 195.

that (1) there are two requirements in Ridley's mind, in order to his accepting the words "really present under the form of bread and wine"; (2) that these requirements demand, in Ridley's judgment, no sense to be put on the words but what they may fairly be made to bear (only that he is well aware that their *doubtfulness* admits also another sense which his adversaries notoriously would have them convey); (3) that these requirements are (*a*) that "really" shall be understood *transcendenter* (which will exclude the *corporal* or *objective* sense, and leave the *sacramental*); and (*b*) that "forms" shall be understood to include *material substances*.

Let this much be conceded, and Ridley will demand no alteration in the words "really present under the forms of bread and wine."

Does Ridley make any objection to the phrase beyond that which pertains to the ambiguities which would thus be removed?

Does not his language imply that (however his opponents might object) the words themselves might well bear the removal, and then might be admitted as true?

Setting aside the difficulty which may be in the words "really present," which do NOT *appear* in the Homily notice, and regarding only those words which *do* appear in the notice, it may be said, I think, to be with Ridley, as with Foxe, that THE *stumbling-block* is in the word *forms*, which word might not unnaturally import, and in the mouths of Romanists was always understood to mean, the outward shows alone, when all the material substance was gone. Only let this doubtfulness be removed, only let it be understood that the word "forms" does not exclude the substance of the elements, and Ridley, it seems, would be content to admit the phrase "under the forms of bread and wine."

(3) I cite next the testimony of Jewel, which is very similar to Ridley's. Thrice Harding quotes against him these words as of St. Augustine[1]: "Caro ejus, quam forma panis opertam in sacramento accipimus; et sanguis ejus, quem, sub vini specie et sapore potamus; caro videlicet carnis, et sanguis est sacramentum sanguinis."

On one occasion Harding says: "In these words of St. Augustine we see the flesh of Christ called a sacrament of His

[1] The words quoted by Harding and others (after Gratian) as from St. Augustine, are found in Lanfranc, not in St. Augustine. (See Albertinus, De Eucharistia, pp. 471, 659.)

flesh, and the blood a sacrament of His blood, inasmuch as they be covered with the form of bread and wine, yet verily and in substance present."

Now, how does Jewel[1] deal with this argument and this quotation? *First*, he shows that "form" does not imply *absence of substance*. *Then* as to "operta" (covered), he shows that similar expressions are used, where bodily presence is out of the question. He quotes (among others) St. Gregory, "Christus . . . in hoc mysterio moritur," where the gloss saith, "Moritur, id est, mors ejus repræsentatur," (Christ dieth, that is to say, His death is represented). "Now," says Jewel, "as Christ *dieth in* the sacrament, so is His *body present* in the sacrament. But Christ dieth NOT there REALLY and INDEED; therefore Christ's BODY is NOT THERE VERILY AND INDEED." And he adds, "I thought it needful to use the more examples on this behalf, for that this place of St. Augustine seemeth to carry the greatest force of all others. But as St. Augustine saith here, Christ's body is hidden under the form or kind of bread: even so he saith 'The grace of God lay hidden in the Old Testament.' . . . Again St. Augustine saith, 'The New Testament was hidden in the Old.' But he expoundeth himself, 'It was *hidden*, that is to say, it was *secretly signified*.' And thus, by St. Augustine's own words and exposition, we may likewise say, 'Christ's flesh is privily *hidden*, that is to say,' as St. Augustine expoundeth it, 'it is PRIVILY SIGNIFIED.'" And Jewel concludes his argument by saying, "Thus St. Augustine's meaning may well stand upright without any new secrecy or real or fleshly presence." (Harding, Thess. etc., pp. 617-619; see also pp. 796, 797.)

But St. Augustine's meaning, which may thus stand upright, is conveyed in words remarkably like our Homily Notice. St. Augustine says, "We RECEIVE His flesh, covered with the *form* of *bread*, and His *blood under* the *form* and flavour of *wine*." And the words of the notice are "of the due RECEIVING of His blessed body and blood, under the form of bread and wine."

I think, I cannot then be wrong, in saying that, however undesirable it might be thought *now* to use such language as, in St. Augustine's time, might give no occasion of misunderstanding, yet clearly in Jewel's judgment the words of

[1] After the extracts given in Paper III., pp. 77-87, it is surely needless to adduce evidence here of Jewel's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence.

the Notice "may well stand upright," and that without any "real or fleshly presence."[1]

(4) Next I will quote from Calvin, who affirms, "In the Supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given *under the signs of bread and wine.*"[2] (Inst., iv., 17, § 32.)

I give the words *verbatim* as translated and quoted, with approval, by Jeremy Taylor, who regards them as expressing "OUR sense of the REAL PRESENCE." (Real Presence, 1, § 5. Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 14.)

And I do this, on purpose that the expression may be seen to bear the seal of approval of an eminent English prelate—a seal too, set upon it in a treatise[3] which is most distinct and emphatic in denying and repudiating, and condemning the doctrine of "the Real Presence" in any such sense as that in which it is taught by our opponents.

Here that is said of the *giving*, which in the Notice is said of the *receiving;* and the only difference in expression is the use of the word "signs" instead of "form," which I imagine (the doctrine of transubstantiation being not in question) all will allow to be perfectly immaterial. Indeed in the declaration of the twenty-one clergymen, both these expressions are used as equivalents, or the one as the explanation of the other, for it is there said, "are present . . . under 'the outward visible part or *sign*' *or* '*form* of bread and wine.'"

(5) My next quotation shall be from "The defence of a certain poor Christian man, who else should have been condemned by the Pope's law." It was translated by Coverdale,

[1] So the learned Dr. Andrew Willet, making an argument against the Carnal Presence from the words of St. Cyprian [*Panem Angelorum sub Sacramento manducamus*, etc.], says: "We eat the bread of angels *under a sacrament* in earth; we shall eat the same without a sacrament more manifestly in heaven. The same body shall be eaten in heaven which is eaten in earth, though not after the same manner: but Christ's flesh shall not be eaten in heaven, therefore it is not eaten in earth." (Synopsis Papismi, vol. vi., p. 47. Edit. 1852.)

[2] "In sacra cœna jubet me sub symbolis panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem suum sumere, manducare ac bibere, nihil dubito quin et ipse verè porrigat, et ego recipiam."

Elsewhere Calvin says, "Quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque Corporis et sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub *sacris cœnæ symbolis* fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio." (iv., 17, § 19.) And again, "Dico igitur, in cœnæ mysterio *per symbola panis et vini*, Christum vere nobis exhiberi adeoque Corpus et sanguinem ejus." (iv., 17, § 11.)

Yet with this is the clear rejection of the Corporal Presence. He says, "All inventions contrary to this are to be rejected, such as the ubiquity of Christ's body, the *inclosing it under the symbol* of bread, and his substantial presence upon earth." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 59.)

[3] See quotations in Paper III., p. 86, note; and p. 88, note.

and the translation is given in Coverdale's Works (P. S. Edit., "Remains," p. 450, sqq.). There it is said, "The memorial of Christ's holy Supper was instituted by himself *under both the forms of bread and wine*." (Page 472.)

And again, a little further, "Christ . . . did not for nought, or without a cause, ordain this remembrance *under both forms of bread and wine*."[1]

This language, it will be observed, carries the sanction of both the writer and the translator, neither of whom can be supposed to be supporters of the Corporal Presence.

And here is a saying which will very well justify the phrase of the Notice before us. For if it be right to say that Christ instituted this memorial *under the forms of bread and wine*, and it is not in question that in that memorial we receive the body and blood of Christ, it cannot be in the proper language of the Reformed, incorrect to say that we receive Christ's body and blood "under the form of bread and wine."

(6) The next citation shall be from the examination of William Thorpe, 1407, given in Bale's Works (P. S. Edit., p. 71). "I believe that in the day next before that he would suffer passion on the morn, *in form of bread and wine*, he ordained the sacrament of his flesh and blood, that is, his own precious body, and gave it to his apostles for to eat." A similar phrase is used by Thorpe, as expressive of his belief, in p. 92. But I do not dwell upon these forms of expression as used by Thorpe,[2] about whose views on this subject we may not be able to speak very certainly. I wish only to call atten-

[1] The same writer says a little further on (p. 473), "The right and wholesome remembrance of the Supper of the Lord, is it that is done *in faith;* namely, when we believe that the body of Christ was given for us, and that His blood was shed for us." And again (pp. 470, 471), "Let us look, wherefore they call it a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea to be abhorred of all virtuous men. . . . But they will say, 'Christ is not so sacrificed in the mass, that He dieth again upon the cross;' but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice, that once was made. Why do they then call it a sacrifice, seeing it is but a remembrance of a sacrifice?" It is perfectly clear from these passages, that the writer was very far from the views of those who maintain the "Real Objective Presence."

[2] Thorpe was a priest, suspected to be a Lollard. He was brought up for examination before Archbishop Arundel. Collier says, "His answer, with reference to the holy Eucharist, appears sound and well guarded." (Church History, iii., p. 276.) The point on which his examination turned was *the abiding of the substance of bread*. But it appears that he taught that "for certes the virtue and the meed of the most holy sacrament of the altar standeth mickle more in the belief thereof that ye ought to have in your soul, than it doth in the outward sight thereof." (See Bale's "Select Works," P. S. Edit., p. 91.)

tion to the marginal note[1] or gloss on Thorpe's words, "That is *under the creatures of bread and wine*," as indicating, that thus explained (and the Ritualists would themselves so explain it) the words might be understood in a sense not to be disallowed by the reformed. The words indeed of Thorpe are but just equivalent to the words before cited as translated and allowed by Coverdale.

(7) My next quotation shall be from Bishop Bilson, who while condemning the Papists for *shrouding* Christ "under the forms of bread and wine," and teaching that "the sacrament is not, but only annexed as a sign to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present," has the following very observable passage:—

"*Phi.* (*Philander, the Jesuit*) By this place [of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite] you see Christ is *covered* WITH THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE, as with garments, and that is word for word our opinion.

"*Theo.* (*Theophilus, the Christian*) Add συμβολικῶς, *figuratively*, as your author doth, and then both YOUR REAL PRESENCE IS OVERTHROWN, *and the doctrine which we teach clearly established.*[2] For we confess that Christ worketh in us, and *presenteth Himself* unto us in these mysteries, as it were, in certain *veils and coverings*, which, *mystically*, by way of *signification* and *spiritual operation, contain and clothe* His grace and truth: but NOT REALLY, nor by *material or corporal inclusion*, as you affirm; and so Himself expresseth His mind in this very chapter. . . . Christ is SIGNIFIED and *received* by these signs and figures . . . but that *Christ is locally or substantially closed within the forms of bread and wine.* . . . Dionysius hath no such sense nor words . . . signs and figures the ancient fathers[3] do not take for *shows* and *accidents*,

[1] Which has the authority of both Foxe and Bale. (See Foxe's Acts and Monuments, A.D. 1409, Seeley's Edit., vol. iii., p. 253.)

[2] So Bishop Lake speaks of "*feeding by faith on Christ* as He *represents Himself* VEILED *in the Church militant.*" But Bishop Lake says elsewhere: "Our eating and drinking must not only feed upon Christ's body and blood, but upon them as the one was *broken*, and the other *shed*,—as they were the propitiatory sacrifice." Further evidence, if required, of Bishop Lake's opposition to the Real Objective view may be seen in "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 835-839.

[3] It will be observed that, with Bilson, as with Foxe, and Ridley, and Jewel, *the* stumbling-block (the presence being understood *sacramentally*) is the *doubtfulness* of the phrase in relation to the question of the absence or presence of the substances of the elements. Bilson's repudiation of the "Real Objective Presence" has been, I think, sufficiently shewn in Paper No. III., p. 68, sqq. He says, only a few pages beyond the extract given above: "The sacraments take their force *only* and *wholly* from the word. . . . Christ cometh and dwelleth in us, as truly by His

as you do, but for *substantial* and usual *creatures.*" (True Difference, etc., Edit. 1585, pp. 716, 717.)[1]

Here we have an author most clearly disallowing both the Romish and Lutheran view, yet declaring that "the doctrine we teach" may be fairly expressed and *established* by the expression covered *with the forms of bread and wine*, understood as they should be understood, *figuratively*. And that because "Christ is signified and *received by these signs.*" Clearly then in his view, there could be no question, that there might well be a right and sound understanding of the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine."

(8) Equally conclusive as to the matter before us are the words of Bishop Morton, who in his views of opposition[2] to the Corporal Presence was in thorough accord with our Reformers. He writes thus:—"In this sacrament . . . His precious body and blood . . . conveyed . . . *under the signs* and seals of *bread and wine* consecrated to that use."[3] (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, p. 130.) Clearly then, I think it appears that Bishop Morton, with all his strong repugnance to the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, would have felt no difficulty in accepting the terms of the notice before us.

(9) I may add that Bishop Nicholson, whose views (though he has been quoted in its support) were very clearly[4] opposed

word as by His sacraments; and if you compare them, more truly by His word than by the *signs* and *seals* of His word." (Page 720.)

[1] See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 798, 799.

[2] See below, note, p. 262.

[3] The whole passage will be found quoted below, pp. 168, 169. Several words are omitted in this extract.

[4] Witness the following, "The word *really*, is diversely taken. For sometimes —1. It is opposed to that which is feigned, and is but imaginary, and imports as much as *truly*. 2. It is opposed to that which is merely figurative, and barely representative, and imports as much as *effectually*. 3. It is opposed to that which is spiritual, and imports as much as *corporally* or *bodily*. We then believe Christ to be present in the Eucharist DIVINELY [*i.e.*, as He had before said *as God*] after a special manner; SPIRITUALLY, *in the hearts of the communicants;* SACRAMENTALLY, or RELATIVELY, *in the elements*. And this presence of His is *real*, in the two former acceptions of *real*, but not in the last, for He is TRULY and EFFECTUALLY there present, though NOT CORPORALLY, BODILY, *carnally*, *locally*." (Edit. Oxford, 1866, p. 217.)

Again, "Whatsoever Christ hath done already, or hath promised hereafter to do for us, are to us as never done, as never to be done, till we believe them: *that which gives them a being, and makes them present and existent to us, is our faith.*" (Ibid. p. 223.)

Again, "It is as clear as the sun, that this sacrament is received by, and *only by* THE FAITHFUL. Unbelievers may receive *panem Domini*, the bread of the Lord; *believers* ONLY *panem Dominum*, that bread which is the Lord." (Ibid. p. 225.)

For further evidence, if required, of Bishop Nicholson's views as opposed to the

to the "Real Objective Presence," has sanctioned this same form of expression, as capable of conveying only the notion of a relative Presence. He says, "The Eucharist is a sacrament instituted by Christ *under the elements of bread and wine*, to represent, exhibit, and seal the passion of Christ and the benefits thereof to a worthy communicant." (Exposition of Catechism, Edit. Oxford, 1866, p. 215.)

Again, speaking of the different forms of speech used to express the Eucharistic Presence, he maintains that many expressions used by Lutherans may be understood in a sense not to be objected to. He says, "All the words used by divines in this mystery may receive a candid interpretation, except that of Rome. 1. That Christ is in the sacrament corporally, substantially, and perhaps consubstantially, may have a respect to the subject or supposite, of the *relatum or correlatum*, there meaning no more than that he is *there under the forms of bread and wine, not changed in substance* BUT IN USE; as it is in other relations; as, for example, betwixt a father and a son: who though they relate to each other, yet they remain two distinct substances, and the same they were." (Ibid. p. 216.) Here we have an expression certainly not less objectionable than that of the Homily notice, yet certainly not used to express any Real Objective Presence.

(10) To these examples I will add that of Bishop Patrick, who while maintaining that "the REAL PRESENCE IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN THE BREAD AND WINE, BUT IN THOSE THAT RECEIVE THEM, according as learned Hooker speaks,"[1] yet has not hesitated to say that Christ "doth exhibit Himself unto us UNDER THESE SHADOWS OF BREAD AND WINE;"[2] words which certainly so far as they differ from the formula in the notice differ in the way of making it more objectionable. At least it seems absolutely necessary to understand the word *shadows* here as being used in a sense precisely equivalent to *forms* or *signs*, not as having anything *shadowy* in their nature, beyond their *inferior* relation to the higher REALITIES and the correct resemblance which shadows bear to their real substances. Just

Real Objective Presence, the reader may be referred to pp. 214-225. He appears to be very much of the same mind as Hooker, whose "very pious judgment" he quotes (p. 215). He was chosen as one of the Westminster "Assembly of Divines," but did not appear. (See Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. ii., p. 209. See also "Goode on Eucharist," ii., pp. 702-704.)

[1] Mensa Mystica, ch. v., § iii. 4, p. 90, Edit. 1717.

[2] Mensa Mystica, ch. v., § iii. 4, p. 87, Edit. 1717. See "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., pp. 861, 862.

as we shall presently find our Homily exhorting us so to come to the Lord's table as to receive "not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure, but the truth; not the *shadow* only, but the BODY."

It was in this sense, no doubt, that the bishop used the word. And if so, we have here a phrase which stands exactly on a level with that in the Homily notice. And we know that the writer meant to speak of no Corporal Presence.[1]

(11) And I may venture here to add yet one other citation from one who with the Reformers stands very distinctly opposed to the Lutheran as well as the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist. I mean Dr. Waterland.[2] He has said, after making

[1] The following passages from Bishop Patrick are here given in case any should desire clearer evidence of his not holding anything like the "Real Objective Presence": "These [elements] are *tokens* of His presence, and represent Him to us, the Spirit, is that whereby He is present." (Mensa Mystica, p. 87.) "Christ doth not descend *locally* unto us, that we may feed on Him; but as the sun toucheth us by his beams without removing of its sphere, so Christ comes down upon us by the power of the Holy Ghost." (Ibid. p. 87.) "The Spirit of Christ grows unto a greater strength within us as we receive more of heavenly nutriment into our souls. And this is *all that is meant by the* REAL PRESENCE of Christ in this sacrament, which the Church speaks of and believes, as it is one reason, likewise, of the *change* which is so much noised, because by His power these things become effectual to so great purpose when they are holily received. Our Lord doth call these signs by the name of the things they signify, because, in a *spiritual manner*, His body and blood are present to us, VIZ., by the *communication of* THAT *to us* WHICH THEY DID PURCHASE FOR US." (Ibid. p. 89.) "The *change* is in *our souls* and NOT in the *sacrament*." (Ibid. p. 91.) "If it be *worthily received*, it is the body and blood of Christ; if unworthily, it is *but* BARE *bread and wine*." (Ibid. p. 91.)

Further evidence, if desired, may be found in his later work, "The Christian Sacrifice," part ii., section vi., pp. 50-61. Edit. 1690.

[2] Waterland's repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is now, I think, generally conceded. Any who may be doubtful on the subject will find evidence in quotations to be given in Paper No. VI. It may suffice here to set down the following: "Luther first, and afterwards Zuinglius, attempted a reform in this article; but it was difficult to clear off the thick darkness all at once; and so neither of them did it to such perfection as might have been wished. One threw off *transubstantiation* very justly, but yet retained I know not what *corporal*, *local* presence, and, therefore, did not retrench enough: the other threw off withal (or too much neglected) the *spiritual presence* and *spiritual graces:* which was retrenching a great deal too much. [See note in Paper No. I., p. 20.] It must, however, be owned that apologies have been since made for Zuinglius, as for one that erred in *expression* rather than in real *meaning*, or that corrected his sentiments on second thoughts. And it is certain that his friends and followers, within a while, came into the old and true notion of *spiritual* benefits." (Works, vol. iv., pp. 599, 600.)

"To the Lutherans, who seem to contend for a *mixture* of the *visible* elements with the body *invisible*, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a *symbolical* delivery, or conveyance, of one by the other; which effectually answers every good end and purpose, as it suits, also, extremely well with the Scripture phraseology in those cases." (Ibid. p. 608.)

"What is a *sacramental union*, with a body *spiritually* present, while *corporally*

long quotations from Bishop Barlow and Dean Aldrich, "The sum of all is, that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and the blood shed, *under the signs or symbols of bread and wine*."[1] ("On the Eucharist," chap. viii., Works, vol. iv., p. 607.)

Here we see how naturally a phrase, exactly equivalent to that used in the Homily notice (understanding *form* as equivalent to *signs*), comes up to express the summing up of a view of the Eucharist entirely distinct from and opposed to that of the Real Objective Presence.

(12) Yet once more I will go back to cite (by way of explanation) the following passage from Jewel. "M. Harding argueth further, 'Christ's body is so received as it is present; but it is present by bread and wine (ye say); ergo, it is received by bread and wine; to conclude, if by bread and wine, then not by faith only.' If M. Harding had better considered the rules of his old sophistry, he might soon have seen the wants and deformities of this reason. . . . It is true that on our part it is not either our hand or our mouth, but faith only that receiveth the body of Christ; but the same body of Christ *is offered and represented* unto our faith by mean of the sacraments. *We speak* of such instruments of receiving as are *of ourself*, and be within us; *M. Harding answereth* of the sacraments that be *external instruments* and are wholly without us."[2]

It is to be observed that here we have Jewel's defence of that part of his Apology in which he had said "*by them* (i.e. the bread and wine) Christ Himself . . . is so presently *given* unto us, as that by *faith* we verily *receive* His body and blood."

Harding has been endeavouring, out of Jewel's own mouth, to prove that the reception cannot be by *faith only*. Jewel replies vindicating the truth of reception by faith only, yet acknowledging that in one sense we "receive the body and blood of Christ by bread and wine," and that because "the

absent? Or what *ideas* can any one really have under these *terms* more than that *mystical* or *moral* union . . . an union as to *virtue* and *efficacy*, and to all *saving* intents and purposes?" (Ibid. p. 641.)

[1] So John Owen speaks of "the exhibition of Christ *to the souls of believers*, UNDER THE *outward* SIGNS AND SYMBOLS of bread and wine, by His institution making such a sacramental union between the thing signified and the sign, that the signs remaining to be what they are in themselves, they are unto us the thing that is signified." (Works, Edit. Goold, vol. ix., p. 621.) And, again, he says: "Here is a peculiar way of His exhibition UNDER *outward* SIGNS, and a mysterious reception of Him IN THEM *really*, so as to come to a real substantial incorporation in our souls." (Ibid.)

[2] Apology and Defence, pp. 487, 488.

same body of Christ is *offered and represented* unto our faith *by mean of the sacraments.*"

And surely the same reason which is thus given to support the expression "received by bread and wine," would serve equally well to vindicate the not dissimilar expression "received under the form of bread and wine."

Indeed the phrase "received *under the form* of bread and wine" (understood in the sense of "signs of bread and wine") so far as it adds anything to the phrase "received *by* bread and wine" seems to add just that [1] which in the language of Jewel's Explanation, the words "*represented* unto our faith" seem to add to the words "*offered* to our faith by mean of the sacraments."

These quotations,[2] I trust, will be sufficient to establish my point—that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," and its equivalents, standing in such connexion as that in which they stand in the notice, were not regarded by the Reformers and succeeding Divines [3] (of the same Eucharistic views with our Reformers) as incapable of bearing a sense such as they would have approved,—and that indeed they were sometimes, though not often, actually used by them to express what they would regard as a sound view of Eucharistic doctrine.

But if this be so, then, clearly the phrase in this notice does not bear any stamp which belongs exclusively either to Romish or Lutheran doctrine. It cannot truly be said to convey of necessity a sense which is opposed to the doctrine of the Reformed. It has been accepted already, and it might (if need were) be accepted and used again by those who deny the Corporal Presence. It might stand even in our Articles of Religion, and there not really be repugnant to, only have its sense somewhat straitly limited by, other Articles whose language is clearly determinate against the Real Objective Presence.

The case, then, I think, may fairly be said to stand thus. The notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, contains a phrase, which in England was commonly regarded as a

[1] See Calvin Inst. iv. 17, § 1. "*Signa* sunt panis et vinum, quæ invisibile alimentum, quod percipimus ex carne et sanguine Christi, nobis *repræsentant.*"

[2] Dr. Sherlock has spoken of the eye of faith seeing "Christ really *present under the species of bread and wine.*" (See Oxford Catena, p. 129.) But I have not quoted him in the text, because, though I think his Exposition of the Catechism makes it evident that he did not hold the doctrine of those who now teach "The Real Objective Presence," yet his repudiation of a Corporal Presence cannot be said to be so clear and distinct as that of those whose language I have adduced.

[3] The Extracts given will be found to form a *Catena* completely covering the ground from the early Reformation period to the middle of the 18th century.

phrase of the Romanists. Dr. Pusey has very ably maintained that the words are quite capable of expressing the Lutheran doctrine,[1] and as a matter of fact were so employed by the Lutherans themselves. I venture a step further, and maintain that the phrase—so far as it is used in the notice—is quite capable of bearing the Reformed sense, and as a matter of fact, was sometimes so used by Reformed Divines themselves, while maintaining their doctrines both against Romanists and Lutherans.

And this is quite sufficient to establish what I wish to prove, that the use of such an expression, even if it came in a book of the highest authority, would have no power to weigh anything against distinct doctrinal statements on the other side.

I do not for a moment admit the doctrinal authority of the notice. But even if the most unquestionable and the most supreme authority could fairly be claimed for it, I contend that the use which is made of it to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, must still be an abuse.

For myself, I wish to state clearly, that I do not *stand* at all upon the arguments I have brought forward as to the *innocence* of the phrase; because in my own view all these arguments are needless. The phrase, I believe, does not come from any utterance of the Church.

But still, I have thought it worth while to show, that if any there are who may feel some suspicion on *this* point, and think the ground I stand upon myself somewhat doubtful or shaky, there is plenty of room for them to stand round about me. And with this view I maintain that the phrase does not necessarily teach *any doctrine*. It is not capable of having any doctrine in fairness fastened on it.

It would indeed, be scarcely true to say of it, what Mr. Stuart says of the word "Mass," that it is as colourless as water, as tasteless as the white of an egg.[2] The expression has some-

[1] See "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 18, sqq.

[2] On Low Masses, p. 28. No doubt what Mr. Stuart says of the word "Mass" is quite true; inasmuch as none, I suppose, doubt, that in its origin, the name was quite *innocent*. But it came to pass, at the time of the Reformation, that what the Reformers did "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ," was quite another, and a different, thing from the memorial sacrifice of the Romish priests. One name would not well serve for both. Therefore our Reformers called their "Lord's Supper" a *Communion*, and left the word "*Mass*" for those who had (in their judgment) no true Lord's Supper at all, but only a violation of the Lord's institution. A name indeed, is of little consequence, except that a confusion of names will lead sometimes to a confusion of things. And the Reformers, who laboured hard to build up the *distinction* of the *things*, would

thing of a colour, it has indeed something of a taste. You may say that in the colour there is certainly a Romish hue,[1] and that the taste may have somewhat of a Lutheran flavour. But its colour and its taste are only what it has acquired by standing long in Roman shops and passing on through Lutheran hands. Its substance is older than Luther. It was known long before transubstantiation had its birth. It is, at least, as old as the fifth century. That it should convey the idea of any such Presence, is certainly not owing to anything inherent in itself. Indeed the expression, so far as used in the notice, does not, of necessity, imply any Real Presence at all. *A sacramental*, NOT REAL, presence, in the elements, and a presence of the *res sacramenti* to the faith of the receiver, is all which the terms of the expression can be said at all to require. Dr. Pusey indeed has said, arguing from this notice, "since we receive them (*i.e.* the body and blood of Christ) they *must be* THERE (*i.e.* under the form of bread and wine), in order that we may receive them." ("Presence of Christ," p. 22.)

But when Dr. Pusey wrote these words, he was surely forgetting an illustration not infrequently used by eminent English Divines (by one in particular whom Dr. Pusey elsewhere cites [2] in support of his own Eucharistic views), I mean that of a legal instrument or deed of conveyance.

hardly, I think, thank Mr. Stuart for his endeavours to break down the *distinction* of *names*. (See Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops," Series ii., vol. ii., p. 284, note, and p. 216; and Series i., vol. i., p. 25; Blakeney's Common Prayer, pp. 310-312; and Bulley's Variations, Appendix, No. I., p. 139. Bellarmine, "De Missâ," lib. i., ch. i.)

[1] In England the colour was decidedly Romish rather than Lutheran. Evidence of this may easily be found in the writings of our Reformers. Some Extracts to the purpose may be seen in "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 43, sqq.; and Supplement, pp. 23, 24.

[2] See Bishop Morton on Eucharist: "As though there were not a *truth* in a mystical, and sacramental *deliverance* of Christ his body, except it were by a *corporal*, and material *presence* thereof, which is a transparent falsity, as any may perceive by any Deed of Gift, which by writing, seale, and delivery conveyeth any land or possession from man to man." (Book iv., ch. 1, sect. 22, p. 214.) Again: "A father delivering by politike assurances under hand and seal a portion of land, although an hundred miles distant, and conveying it to his sonne by Deed, if the sonne in scorne should terme the same Deed or writing, blacke inke; the seal, greasie waxe; and the whole act but a *bare signe*. . . . Such like have been your calumnies and opprobrious reproaches against our celebration of the Sacrament of Christ." (Ibid. sec. 3, p. 216; see also Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, pp. 130, 131.)

Dr. Pusey has quoted in support of his doctrine a passage from Bishop Morton's Catholic Appeal, acknowledging in general terms "a real Presence." (See "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," p. 43.) How distinctly Bishop Morton would condemn Dr. Pusey's doctrine the following testing passage will show: "St. Augustine; who for the preservation of the truth of Christ's human nature, will

Surely it were nothing strange—no doing violence to the English language, no unnatural form of speech among us—if I were to say that I received an estate under the form of a piece of parchment by which it was conveyed to me.[1] Surely I might say with perfect propriety that I received £100, under the form of a cheque or a bank-note. And my saying this would certainly not imply that the estate was brought into the room with the parchment to be signed,[2] or that the amount of

not admit of the presence of a bodie in many places at once: for this is (saith he) 'profanely to destroy the proper nature of a bodie, because the bodie which is not circumscribed in one place, is NO WHAT, because NO WHERE.' Many such sentences might be produced, which CANNOT *be eluded* by that only answer of our adversaries, understanding that Christ is not present on earth and in heaven at one time, to wit *visibly*, or by a natural, but *by a* SUPERNATURAL *manner*, which will be too raw matter for their stomaches, who are accustomed unto the arguments of ancient Fathers, whom they find thus arguing: If Christ (according to His bodily presence) *sit at the right hand of the Father in heaven, then doubtless He is not in the world by the presence of His flesh.*" (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 19, p. 113.)

[1] So Dr. Aldrich says:—"It is easy to conceive, how a thing that is locally *absent* may yet be really *received*,—as we commonly say, a man receives an estate, or inheritance, when he receives the *Deeds* or *Conveyances* of it.—The *reception* is confessedly *real*, though the thing itself is not *locally* or circumscriptively *present*." (Quoted in Waterland, Works, iv., p. 606.) So again, "We do not hold that we barely receive the *effects* and benefits of Christ's *body*, but we hold it really *present* in as much as it is *really received*, and we *actually* put in *possession* of it, though *locally* absent from us." (Also quoted in Waterland, Works, iv., p. 607.)

"Variæ sunt investituræ secundum ea quibus investimur: verbi gratia, investitur *canonicus* per *librum*, abbas per *baculum* et *annulum* simul; sicut, inquam, in ejusmodi rebus est, sic et divisiones gratiarum diversis sunt traditæ sacramentis." (St. Bernard as quoted in Waterland, vol. iv., p. 571, note. See Consensus Orthodoxus, Edit. 1605, p. 124.)

Archdeacon Churton speaks of "the mischief of such modes of illustration." (Preface to Waterland's Letters, p. 13. Parker, 1868.)

No doubt they are very damaging to "The Real Objective Presence." But they certainly were not peculiar to "English Divines of the period which followed the Revolution." (Ibid. p. 14.) And however they fall short of conveying *the whole truth*, they have certainly not been accounted mischievous by our Reformers or their successors.

Bishop Cosin says, "The truth of the words of Christ remains constant, and can be defended, without overthrowing so many other great truths. Suppose a testator puts deeds and titles in the hand of his heir with these words, 'Take the house which I bequeath thee;' there is no man will think that those writings and parchments are that very house, which is made of wood and stones; and yet no man will say that the testator spake falsely or obscurely. Likewise our blessed Saviour, having sanctified the elements by His words and prayers, gave them to His disciples as seals of the New Testament; whereby they were as certainly secured of those rich and precious legacies which He left to them, as children are of their father's lands and inheritance by deeds and instruments signed and delivered for that purpose." (History of Transubstantiation, ch. v., Sect. 5, Edit. Oxford, p. 180.)

[2] It was not to be supposed that the similitude of a legal document is used by our Divines as able to express the full truth of the blessings conveyed by the sacrament. Bishop Morton says, "In this sacrament the donor is Christ, the gift is His precious bodie and bloud, the high ransom of man's redemption, conveyed unto

gold was there wrapped up within the note, or present at all under the form of the draft. And why then must the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine," (when we know that similar forms of expression were used by those who denied the doctrine,) be held to teach of necessity the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

III. If I have carried my readers with me thus far, I have little fear of their dissenting from my third proposition, that the way is clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that it may bear witness what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question before us.

The phrase we have been considering is quite capable of being explained and understood in what the Reformed party surely would call a sound sense. The same phrase in a more questionable connexion, as applied to the Presence, was repudiated by Cranmer on behalf of the English Prayer Book. But the phrase as used in the notice does not imply any real presence under the forms of bread and wine.

Yet (lest doubtless it should seem to carry any Popish or Lutheran sound) it is, when the Second Book of Homilies comes forth, rejected, and another title with no such suspicious or doubtful sound substituted for it. What conclusion are we to draw from this? Surely not that the Church of England has deliberately retained a form of expression which shews that she desired to teach her children the Corporal Presence. Rather, I think, we should say, that here seems to be evidence of the care and vigilance, and wise caution of our Church, in that a form of expression [1]—however capable of a sound sense—was deliberately rejected, lest, perchance, an unsound sense should afterwards be nailed upon it. It is, indeed, somewhat curious, certainly it strikes one as very needless, that at the end

mankind by the word and sacrament, as by a visible Deed of Gift *under the signs and seals of* common elements of bread and wine, consecrated to that use; the right receiver is the penitent and faithful communicant. This similitude *agreeth for the manner*, albeit for the EFFECTUALNESS of the manner we say, that the ods is no lesse than heaven and earth. For by this faithful participation, there is wrought in the godly Christian an ineffable and incomprehensible union and conjunction through faith with the humanitie of Christ his Redeemer; whereby he is also made partaker of the Divine nature." (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, pp. 130, 131.) Compare Bullinger's Decades, v., 321. "This must not be dissembled of us, that sacraments have a greater and more effectual force than any sealed charters can have."

[1] Canon Trevor says, "It is clear that its *removal* from the title of the Homily was a designed repudiation of the words, as involving the Corporal Presence, which Cranmer was at first inclined to retain on the Lutheran explanation." ("Sacrifice and Participation," p. 91.)

of the First Book of Homilies, this promissory notice of a Second Book to be issued should continue to stand after the promise has been fulfilled, and the Second Book had been published—that still it should be said "Hereafter shall follow etc.," when there remained no more to follow now, since the *Second* Book had been added to the *First*.

But from whatever cause, it *has* stood: and, but for the mistaken argument which has so strangely been fastened on it, we might be *thankful* that it *has* stood.

If, as some seem to think, the reprinting of the notice rests on no higher authority than that of the king's[1] printer, then we might thank the king's printer for reprinting that which seems clearly to show the determination of our Reforming authorities to reject every vestige of the doctrine of a Corporal Presence. If it had not been reprinted, we should, indeed, have had a Homily most full of sound doctrine, and with a title to which none can take exception. But we should not have known that that title was designedly substituted for another under which the Homily was promised, which other might have seemed to imply a doctrine which the Homily does not teach, and which the Authors of the Second Book of Homilies were resolved that they would not in any way seem even to sanction.

I submit, then, that viewed in relation to the date and history of the publication, and to the change of title and to the doctrine taught in the Homily, the only argument which can fairly be built on the notice is an argument *not for* but *against* the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—an argument (and a very forcible one) not of its deliberate acceptance by our ecclesiastical authorities, but of their jealous care to eliminate from our authorised books every phrase on which such a doctrine might anyways be grafted.

With the way thus made clear before us, what remains will be easy.

There will be no difficulty now in showing (1) That the Homily teaches nothing but what is in full accord with the views of the Reformed. (2) That the Homily teaches much

[1] See "Goode on Eucharist," i., 41; Trevor's "Sacrifice and Participation," p. 90. It seems questionable whether it may not be fairly alleged as weighing considerably against the view of the sole authority of the printer, that the notice is evidently alluded to in the title to the Second Book which reads thus, "The Second Tome of Homilies of such matters as were *promised and entituled* in the former part of Homilies."

which is directly repugnant to the teaching of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

(1) There is indeed one passage from the Homily which has sometimes been quoted on the other side, and claimed as looking like a support of the doctrine in question. But it would be strange indeed if a book of Homilies put forth with authority at a time when, in the judgment of our opponents, theology had reached about its[1] *lowest level* in the Church of England, should be found to be really teaching doctrine which on such a subject as the Real Presence, would raise her theology to a level with the Church of Rome.

Of the passage referred to it will be no hard task to shew, that it simply speaks the language of some of the chiefest opponents of the Corporal Presence.

The passage alluded to is as follows: "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent. But, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ), is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality. The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this supper, some of them the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace and the conservatory to everlasting life" (p. 398).

But what, we may ask, is there here to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence? Is it the earnest claiming for the Lord's Supper that it should be regarded as no "vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent"?

[1] See "Christian Remembrancer," p. 188, Jan., 1866.

But is it not possible [1] for us to reject the "Real Presence" of Rome and yet at the same time to contend earnestly for all the fulness of the blessings of the Lord's Supper, to repudiate the emptying it of the riches of a present Saviour, to protest against its being reduced to bare signs? Is it not possible for us, I ask, to do this? At any rate, we thank God it was constantly done by our Reformers.

They were continually being accused by the Papists of making the sacrament nothing but a vain ceremony; and they were continually denying the accusation.[2] They disclaimed and disowned any such views. Such repudiation comes up almost as from one mouth and with body of voice from the hearts of our Reformers: and that often in almost the same breath with the clearest and strongest statements against the Corporal Presence.

Witness Tyndall:

"That the bread and wine be *no* PROFANE COMMON *signs*, but HOLY *sacraments*, reverently to be considered, and received with a deep faith and remembrance of Christ's death, and of the

[1] "Luther uttered many things very passionately against Zuinglius and others, conceiving that they made the sacraments to be nothing, but only notes distinctive, serving to put difference between Christians and such as are no Christians, as a monk's cowl distinguisheth a monk from him that is no monk, or empty signs, without all presence of grace, and exhibition of the things they signify. But if he had fully understood the meaning of them he was so violently opposite unto, he would not have censured them so hardly as he did." (Dean Field, "Of the Church," E. H. S. Edit., vol. iv., p. 410.) It seems doubtful, however, whether Dean Field estimated aright the point to which High Lutheran doctrine attained. (See Pusey, "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 166, sqq., and "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 840.)

[2] I venture to quote here the following passage from Dean Goode, since those who write in favour of the Real Objective Presence, still seem to regard every other view as leaving the Ordinance empty and void.

"The misconception under which the authors under review appear to labor is, that there is no medium between holding their doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, and maintaining that there is only in that rite a mere exercise of faith in Christ's sacrifice. A more remarkable and groundless misconception could not exist. The real doctrine which they have to meet is this:—that the elements after consecration are holy, and that they are not mere inoperative and inefficacious signs, but that through the Divine appointment and blessing they are means and instruments through the reception of which God gives to the faithful recipient the things themselves of which they are the signs; but that while the signs are given by man to the mouth, the things signified are given by God to the soul; and are as verily and indeed given to and received by the soul as the signs are given to and received by the body; but of course in that spiritual manner which is suitable for such a communication, which differs altogether from the manner in which a thing is given to and received by the bodily mouth." ("Goode on Eucharist," i., pp. 748, 749.)

shedding of His blood for our sins; those sensible things do represent to us the very body and blood of Christ, so that while every man beholdeth with his corporal eye those sensible sacraments, the inward eye of his faith may see, and believe stedfastly, Christ offered and dying upon the cross for his sins, how His body was broken and His blood shed for us, and hath given Himself whole for us, Himself to be all ours, and whatsoever He did to serve us, as to be made for us, of His Father, our righteousness, our wisdom, holiness, redemption, satisfaction." (Answer to More, P. S. Edit., pp. 265, 266.)

Witness Cranmer:

"Although the sacramental tokens be only significations and figures, yet doth Almighty God *effectually work*, in them that duly receive His sacraments, those *divine and celestial operations* which He hath promised, and by the sacraments be signified. For else they were VAIN *and* UNFRUITFUL *sacraments*, as well to the godly as to the ungodly. And therefore I never said of the whole supper, that it is but a signification or a bare memory of Christ's death; but I teach that it is a SPIRITUAL REFRESHING, *wherein our souls be fed and nourished with Christ's* VERY FLESH AND BLOOD *to eternal life*. And therefore bring youforth some place in my book, where I say that the Lord's Supper is *but a* BARE SIGNIFICATION without *any effect or operation of God* in the same; or else eat your words again, and knowledge that you untruly report me." (On Lord's Supper, p. 148.)

Witness Ridley:

"'Sir,' quoth I, 'methinks it is not charitably done, to bear the people in hand that any man doth so lightly esteem the sacrament, as to make of it BUT A FIGURE. For that maketh it (but) a BARE FIGURE *without any more profit;* which that book (*i.e.* Cranmer's Book) doth often deny as appeareth to the reader most plainly. 'Yes,' quoth he, 'that they do.' 'Sir, no,' quoth I, 'of a truth: and as for me, I ensure you I make *no less of the sacrament than thus:* I say, whosoever receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth therewith LIFE OR DEATH.'" (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 161.)

And again:

"Think not . . . that I go about to take away the TRUE PRESENCE of CHRIST'S BODY *in His Supper* rightly and duly minis-

tered, which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful fathers. *They that think so of me*, THE LORD KNOWETH HOW FAR THEY ARE DECEIVED." (Ibid. p. 201.)

Witness Latimer:

"There is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence. . . . And the same presence may be called A REAL PRESENCE, [because to the faithful believer there is the *real or spiritual body of Christ:*] which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the anabaptist, to make *nothing else* of the sacrament but a BARE AND NAKED SIGN. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected from among God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith; and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of antichrist." (Remains, p. 252.)

And again:

"In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the sacraments but lightly, as to be EMPTY and BARE SIGNS; whom the fathers have resisted so fiercely, that in their fervour they seem, in sound of words, to run too far the other way, and to give too much to the sacraments, when they did think more measurably." (In Ridley's Works, p. 115.)

Witness Bradford (and let it be remembered that he was *burnt for maintaining* with a denial of transubstantiation—that an evil man doth not receive the body of Christ "in forma panis.")

"Away with transubstantiation. But here, lest we should make it no sacrament—for a sacrament consisteth of two things,—and lest a man should by this gather that we make it none other thing but BARE BREAD and a NAKED SIGN, and so rail at their pleasure on us, . . . I will now speak a little more hereabout by God's grace, to stop their mouths. . . . In that He speaketh so plainly, saying, THIS IS MY BODY, who can, may, or dare be so bold as to doubt of it? 'He is the truth' and cannot lie: He is omnipotent and can do all things: there-

fore it IS HIS BODY. This I believe, this I confess, and pray you all heartily to BEWARE *of these and such like words, that it is* BUT A SIGN or a FIGURE *of His* BODY; except you will discern betwixt signs which signify only, and signs which also do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification." (Sermons, etc., pp. 92-4.)

Again:

"In the Lord's Supper the bread is called a 'partaking of the Lord's body,' and NOT ONLY A BARE SIGN *of the* BODY of THE LORD. . . . I would wish that this sacrament should be esteemed and called of Christian men, after Christ's words, namely 'CHRIST'S BODY,' and the wine 'CHRIST'S BLOOD,' rather than otherwise. Not that I mean any other presence of Christ's body than a presence by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually, and not corporally, really, naturally, and carnally, as the Papists do mean; for in such sort Christ's body is only in heaven, on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, whither our faith in the use of the sacrament ascendeth, and receiveth whole Christ accordingly."[1] (Ibid. pp. 94, 95.)

Again:

"All the which sayings of the fathers do confirm this our faith and doctrine of the sacrament; we granting in all things herein unto them, and they in like manner unto us. And therefore the lying lips which both belie the doctors, as though they granted a carnal and real presence of Christ's body, naturally and corporally, after the Papist's declaration and meaning, and which belie us also, as though we DENIED ALL PRESENCE OF CHRIST, and so *made it but a* BARE SIGN; these lying lips the Lord will destroy, if they repent not, and with us teach not the truth, and that sacrament is a food of the soul, a matter of faith, and therefore spiritually and by faith to be talked of and understood." (Ibid. pp. 98, 99.)

Witness Hooper:

"I believe . . . the holy sacraments (which are the second mark or badge of the true Church) to be the signs of the recon-

[1] Bradford did not hesitate to write, "The contempt of the sacrament in the days of King Edward hath caused these plagues upon us presently. The Lord be merciful unto us! Amen." (Sermons, etc., p. 96.)

ciliation and great atonement made between God and us through Jesus Christ. They are seals of the Lord's promises, and are outward and visible pledges and gages of the inward faith, and are in number only twain, that is to say, baptism and the holy Supper of the Lord. The which two are *not* VOID *and* EMPTY *signs, but* FULL; that is to say, they are not only signs, whereby something is signified, but also they are *such signs* as *do exhibit and give* the thing that they signify indeed." (Later Writings, p. 45.)

Witness Jewel:

"In speaking thus we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper, or to teach that it is but a COLD CEREMONY ONLY and *nothing to be wrought* therein (as many FALSELY SLANDER US we teach). For we affirm that CHRIST doth TRULY and PRESENTLY GIVE HIMSELF WHOLLY *in His sacraments*, in baptism that we may put Him on; and in His supper, that we may eat Him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not this is done SLIGHTLY or COLDLY, but EFFECTUALLY and truly. For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by spirit. And it is no vain faith that comprehendeth Christ; neither is it received with cold devotion that is received with understanding, faith, and spirit. For CHRIST HIMSELF altogether is SO OFFERED and GIVEN US in these mysteries, that we may CERTAINLY KNOW we be 'FLESH OF HIS FLESH, and BONE OF HIS BONES, and that Christ continueth in us, and we in Him.'" (Apol. and Defence, p. 523.)

Again:

"Whereas M. Harding, as well herein, as also in the rest, untruly and *unjustly defameth* us, as making the sacraments of Christ nothing else but BARE TOKENS; let him well understand that we do both think and speak soberly and reverently of Christ's sacraments, as knowing them to be the testimonies of God's promises, and the instruments of the Holy Ghost. And, as we make not the sacrament of baptism bare water, notwithstanding the nature and substance of water remain still; so we make not the sacrament of Christ's body and blood bare bread and wine. We use the same words and definitions that St. Augustine and other ancient fathers . . . have used before us." (Sermon and Harding, p. 515.)

Again:

"Whereas M. Harding thus *unjustly reporteth* of us, that we maintain a NAKED FIGURE and a BARE SIGN or TOKEN only, and nothing else; if he be of God, he knoweth well he should not thus bestow his tongue or hand to *bear false witness.* It is written: 'God will destroy them all that speak untruth.' He knoweth well we *feed* NOT the people of God with BARE SIGNS and FIGURES, but teach them that the sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministration thereof Christ is set before us even as He was crucified upon the cross; and that therein we may behold the remission of our sins, and our reconciliation unto God; and, as Chrysostom briefly saith, 'Christ's great benefit, and our salvation.' Herein we teach the people, not that a NAKED SIGN OR TOKEN, but that CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD INDEED and verily is GIVEN UNTO us; that we verily eat it; that we verily drink it; that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of His bones, and flesh of His flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Him." (Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

Witness Hooker:

"We take not baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 258.)

Again:

"It GREATLY OFFENDETH, that some, when they labour to show the use of the Holy Sacraments, assign unto them no end but only TO TEACH the mind, by other senses, that which the word doth teach by hearing." (Ibid. p. 255.)

Again:

"It seemeth therefore MUCH AMISS that against them whom they term Sacramentaries *so many invective discourses are made* all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not A BARE SIGN OR FIGURE ONLY, and that the EFFICACY OF HIS BODY

AND BLOOD IS NOT ALL WE RECEIVE in this sacrament. For no man having read their books and writings which are thus traduced can be ignorant that both these assertions they *plainly confess to be most true.* They do not so interpret the words of Christ as if the name of His body did import but the *figure of His body*, and to be were only to *signify His blood.* They grant that these holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally both *make us partakers* of *the grace of that body and blood* which were given for the life of the world, and besides also *impart unto us* even in *true and real* though *mystical manner* the VERY PERSON OF OUR LORD HIMSELF, WHOLE, PERFECT AND ENTIRE, as hath been shewed." (Ibid. p. 355.)

Witness Becon:

"O the inestimable treasures that lie bent out in this most holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ for the faithful! Blessed is he that is a faithful guest of this celestial table. Blessed is he that with a pure faith and sincere charity eateth the body of his Lord. Blessed is that man which receiveth this most honourable sacrament with an undefiled conscience; for Satan, sin, death, hell, desperation, etc., shall not prevail against him. Such one may be sure to dwell in Christ and Christ in him. Such one may be sure to have his heart abundantly enforced with celestial graces and heavenly gifts. Such one may be sure to have God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost dwelling perpetually in his breast. When ye have done these things aforesaid, then draw nigh, when time requireth, with all humble and reverent fear unto the feast of the Lord's body." (Early Writings, p. 119.)

Witness Willet:

"In the Eucharist, the death of Christ with the fruit thereof, which is the remission of sins, is *not only represented*, but *exhibited* also and *applied:* for otherwise they will make it but a BARE AND NAKED SIGN, if it should only represent and signify. . . . Wherefore I thus urge them, as Christ's blood is present, so is the fruit of His blood: but His blood is not present only in signification, but verily and indeed to the worthy receiver: *ergo*, so is remission of sins, which is the fruit of His blood." ("Synopsis Papismi," Edit. 1852, vol. v., pp. 280, 281.)

With these testimonies from our Reformers compare the following from Bullinger :—

"They object, I know well enough, against these things that we do evacuate and make of none effect the sacraments, and that we teach that the faithful receive in them or by them, nothing but bare water and bare bread and wine; and that by that means God by us is accused of falsehood and lying. We briefly answer; if they set void or empty things (as I may so say) against full things so as they be void or empty which have not the things themselves included in them; truly, I had rather confess them to be void than full. But if they call them void or empty, and mean profane or unholy things, that is to say, which differ nothing from profane signs; if by bare they understand things of no force, we openly profess that we have sacraments which are holy and not profane, *effectual and not without force; garnished from above,* not naked; and *therefore full, not void or empty.* For they are holy things and not profane, because they are instituted of God, and for godly men, not for profane persons. They are *effectual* and *not without force;* for in the church with the godly and faithful *they work the same effect and end whereunto they* are *ordained* of God; whereof more hereafter. They are also worthily said to be beautified and adorned by God, and not bare things, which have the word of God itself wherewith they are most beautifully adorned. And therefore also they are *full, and not empty sacraments,* because they *have those things which make a perfect sacrament.*"[1] (Decades, v., 313, 314.)

Now what is there in the teaching and testimony quoted from the Homily which we have not in the teaching and testimony here quoted from the Reformers? And that the teaching and testimony of the Homily is to be understood in no higher sense

[1] Calvin says, "I have a hundred times disclaimed the receiving only of a figure in this sacrament." And again, "Our Catechism teacheth not only a signification of the benefits of Christ to be had herein, but also a participation of the substance of Christ's flesh in our souls." (Quoted in Morton on Eucharist, v., ch. 1, Sect. 2, p. 309.)

The following is from the "Consensus Orthodoxus" :—

"Cur ex Zuinglii et Calvini nomine potissimum conflata invidia, tam odiose et obstinate exagitantur, nullo maledicendi fine, nec modo? Cum satis abunde jam constet, *non* NUDA *aut* VACUA in sacramentis signa, neque etiam quamlibet vulgarem, aut inanem significationem statui, sed in mysterii virtute efficacem, utpote, quæ in veritate verbi et promissionis significatæ rei exhibitionem et obsignationem conjunctam habeat." ("Consensus Orthodoxus," Edit. 1605, p. 134.)

than the similar teaching of the Reformers is made quite clear I think by the following words which follow immediately after the passage quoted.

"All which sayings both of the Holy Scripture and godly men, truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast, if we would often call to mind, O how would they inflame our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food! NOT *as* SPECIALLY *regarding the* TERRENE *and* EARTHLY CREATURES which remain; but always holding fast and CLEAVING BY FAITH to THE ROCK, whence we may suck the sweetness of everlasting salvation. And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know the *favourable* MERCIES *of God* SEALED, the SATISFACTION by Christ towards us CONFIRMED, and THE REMISSION of SIN ESTABLISHED." (Pages 398, 399.)

There is nothing else, I think, in the Homily which need require one word to be said for the purpose of removing any seeming difficulty. Is there nothing then, at all in the Homily which can be said to look like the teaching of the Real Objective Presence? Most emphatically it may be answered "No." What may be called the "highest teaching" of the Homily, is nothing more than can easily be matched from the writings of those who most clearly and strongly opposed everything like such a doctrine.

(2) It only remains now to bring evidence that the Homily does contain that which is repugnant to the doctrine of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

For this purpose the following Extracts will suffice:—

I.

"Our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the REMEMBRANCE of His great MERCY expressed in His PASSION in the institution of His heavenly supper, where every one of us must be GUESTS and NOT GAZERS, EATERS and NOT LOOKERS, FEEDING OURSELVES, and NOT *hiring other to eat for us*, that we may live by our own meat, and not perish for hunger whiles other devour all. To this His commandment forceth us, saying do ye this; drink ye all of this. To this His promise enticeth, This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood,

which is shed for you. So then of necessity we must be *ourselves* PARTAKERS OF THIS TABLE, *and* NOT BEHOLDERS *of other*." (Pages 395, 396.)

II.

"Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the author. We must then take heed, lest OF THE MEMORY IT BE MADE A SACRIFICE, lest of a COMMUNION it be made a *private eating*, lest of two parts we have but one, lest *applying it for the dead*, we *lose the fruit that be alive*." (Page 396.)

III.

"Now, it followeth *to have with this knowledge* a *sure and* CONSTANT FAITH, *not only that the death of Christ is available* for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sin and reconciliation with God the Father; but also *that He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for* THEE, a *perfect cleansing of* THY *sins*, so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, redeemer, mediator, advocate, intercessor, but Christ only, and that thou mayest say with the apostle, that *He loved* THEE, and *gave Himself for* THEE. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in His institution, TO MAKE CHRIST THINE OWN and to APPLY HIS MERITS UNTO THYSELF. Herein thou needest NO OTHER MAN'S HELP, NO OTHER SACRIFICE OR OBLATION, NO SACRIFICING PRIEST, *no* MASS, *no means established by man's invention*. That FAITH is a NECESSARY INSTRUMENT in all these holy ceremonies, we may thus assure ourselves, for that, as St. Paul saith, without faith it is impossible to please God." (Page 399.)

IV.

"It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat, and not bodily; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; so that *to think that* WITHOUT FAITH *we* MAY ENJOY the EATING AND DRINKING THEREOF, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a GROSS CARNAL FEEDING, *basely objecting and* BINDING OURSELVES TO THE ELEMENTS AND CREATURES. Whereas, by the advice of the Council of Nicene we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the sun of righteousness ever shineth. Take then this lesson O thou that

art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou LOOK UP WITH FAITH upon the *holy body and blood of thy God*, thou marvel with reverence, thou *touch it with the mind*, thou receive it with the *hand of thy* heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man." (Pages 399, 400.)

V.

"The *unbelievers* and *faithless* CANNOT *feed upon that precious body*. Whereas the *faithful* have their life, their abiding in Him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with Him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body, whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of His gospel and embracing of His mercies in Christ Jesus; so that at this His table we receive *not only the outward sacrament*, but THE SPIRITUAL THING also, not *the figure, but* THE TRUTH; not the *shadow only, but* THE BODY; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to salvation; which God grant us to do through the merits of our Lord and Saviour; to whom be all honour and glory for ever." (Page 400.)

To these extracts from the Homily "Concerning the Sacrament," we may add yet another from "The Second Part of the Sermon for Whitsunday."

VI.

"Now if we will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesu; neither yet do they order the sacraments or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as He did first institute and ordain them: but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to His Church *a* SACRAMENT *of His body and blood:*

they have CHANGED *it into a* SACRIFICE *for the quick and the dead.*" (Page 414.)

Strained attempts may be made to fasten on some of these passages something else than their natural meaning. But, as a whole, they may be safely left to speak for themselves as to the question before us.

Those who read them carefully will not long hesitate as to which side of the controversy they fairly belong to.

Those who have any acquaintance with the teaching of the Ritualists will be ready to pronounce at once, "This is not the language of those who now teach the Real Objective Presence."

Since writing this Paper, I have seen the valuable Charge of the Bishop of Llandaff (Rivingtons, 1869), from which I extract the following as an additional support to my argument concerning the words of the Notice appended to the First Book of Homilies :—

"Even if these words were authorised by the compilers of the Second Book of Homilies, considering the distinct and explicit declarations of their sentiments . . . we may fairly conclude that they retained them in the belief that they were as capable of application to their own view of the Real Presence, as they had before been used to represent Transubstantiation, or as they might have been to express the Objective Presence, if any one had then propounded that opinion. Mr. Keble (p. 158) quotes from Bertram, or Ratramn, who is known to have influenced Ridley's opinions, and through him those of Cranmer, 'Sub velamento corporei Panis corporeique Vini spirituale Corpus spiritualisque Sanguis existit;' but he also quotes from the same writer, 'Panis ille vinumque *figurate* Corpus et Sanguis existit.' If the strong expression of the first sentence may be explained by the *figurate* of the second, there is no reason why the words of this notice may not be interpreted by language elsewhere employed in reference to the same subject. The Reformers may well have understood and used the words *figurate*, and deemed them to have a sense in harmony with their own convictions.

"The notice, moreover, is so expressed that we are under no necessity of supposing it to imply that the Body and Blood of Christ are in themselves in any sense whatever under the form of Bread and Wine." (Page 147.)

And I may add that the use of expressions such as Bertram's "sub velamento" is common to those whose repudiation of the Real Objective Presence is beyond question. It is used, for example, by the Puritan Sibbes; "*Under these veils* is signified, and more than that, exhibited unto us, the body and blood of Christ Jesus." (Works, Nichol's Edit., X., vol. iv., p. 61. See above, p. 160, and note.)

So Bishop Patrick says: "The sacraments being not unfitly called by an ancient writer *the garments that are cast about our Saviour*, and

it being the profession of divines to labour to see the naked face of Truth, it is most worthy our pains to open and reveal those secrets that lie hid and *vailed under symbols and sensible things*." ("Mensa Mystica," Introduction, Sect. I.)

The reader may also be asked to compare the following words of Bishop Jeremy Taylor:—"When things *spiritual* are SIGNIFIED by *materials*, the *thing* UNDER *the figure* is called *true*, and the material part is opposed to it as less true or real," (Real Presence, Sect. I. 6, vol. vi., p. 14, Edit. Eden,)—where, in the Bishop's sense, "*the things under*" are *not* UNDER at all in *real* being, but in signification only, as is abundantly clear from the examples in the context. "The examples of *this*," he goes on to say, "are not infrequent in Scripture. The tabernacle into which the high priest entered was a type, or a figure of heaven. Heaven itself is called σκηνὴ ἀληθινὴ, 'the *true* tabernacle'; and yet the other was the *material* part." So that, among the unseen realities which, in the Bishop's language, are said to be *under* material shadows, *heaven is* UNDER *the holy of holies:* and it needs no argument to shew that *this* must be NOT in *presence*, but in *signification*.

The *material signs*, in such language, are as *veils* to the true but invisible *things signified*, which, in such language, are said to be *under* them, because *signified* and *exhibited* by them.

Just as we have seen Foxe speaking of the *res sacramenti* as being "UNDER *the forms*" (or material elements); though, certainly, in his view, NOT *under* them at all in *real presence*, but only in the way of sacramental *signification* and *conveyance*.

In connexion with this, let me be allowed to fortify my argument yet further by reference to the language of what is commonly known as Cranmer's Catechism. From the German it was translated into Latin by Justus Jonas; and from the Latin version an English translation was made under Cranmer's direction. The English translation of this was published in 1548; and Cranmer always owned to the responsibility of this. The Catechism has a Lutheran sound; and its Lutheran origin, I believe, is not questioned. (See Burton's Preface to Oxford Edition, p. xxi.) It is to be observed, however, that some of the expressions most objectionable in the Latin, are altered in the English translation. Thus the "sacramentum altaris" (p. 181, Edit. Oxford,) of the Latin, is "the Communion or Lord's Supper," in the English (p. 213, Edit. Oxford). And instead of the Latin "Credere debemus, quod vere corpus et sanguis ejus sit," (p. 177) we have in the English, "We ought to believe that in the sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ." (Page 208. See Preface, pp. xviii., xxii.) In like manner a plate, representing an altar with candles, and "priest apparelled after the old sort," was "left out." (See Cranmer "On Lord's Supper," P. S. Edit., p. 227.)

Now the design of such changes is, I think, sufficiently apparent. And, though Cranmer acknowledged that not long before the publication of this Catechism he had been in the *error of the Real*

Presence (On Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., p. 374); yet he always maintained that the language of this Catechism was defensible. He declares it was *untruly* reported, that he "in that book did set forth *the real presence* of Christ's body in the sacrament," (p. 374). He said that his saying there "ignorant persons (not used to read *old ancient authors*, nor acquainted with *their phrase and manner of speech*) did carp and reprehend, for *lack of good understanding*," (p. 226). He declares, "In that Catechism I teach not (as you do) that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament reserved, but that in the *ministration* thereof *we receive* the body and blood of Christ, whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word 'spiritually,' then is the *doctrine* of my Catechism *sound and good* in all men's ears, which know the true doctrine of the sacraments." (On Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., p. 227. See note in Remains, p. 218; and Burton's Preface, pp. 17-21.)

Yet, let it be well observed, in the Latin of this Catechism we have the words "est verum corpus, et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, *sub pane et vino*, nobis Christianis ad edendum et bibendum ab ipso Christo institutum," (p. 181). And the English given for this is as follows: "It is the true body and true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was ordained by Christ Himself, to be eaten and drunken of Christian people, *under the form of bread and wine*." (Page 213. Compare Calvin as quoted above, p. 158, note.)

Is not the conclusion inevitable, that Cranmer did not regard such language as incapable of a reformed sense? While altering another expression only two lines above, he lets this expression stand; and, not only so, but subsequently he defends the language and doctrine of the Catechism. He might afterwards have expressed himself more guardedly, and less ambiguously; but in the *ambiguity* of the phrase he *must* have considered that there was room for the sense of those who repudiated all teaching of "real presence" *under the forms*.

No. VI.

THE CATECHISM.

We have to enter now on what may be called a new field of enquiry. A wide interval separates between the writings and books which have been before us hitherto, and those documents which may be strictly called the Authorized Formularies of our Church. We are passing from *works* of *some* authority to works of a far higher authoritative value. We come now to examine teaching which we find in our Prayer Book.

And desiring to proceed still upon the same plan of ascending from those of lower, step by step, to those of higher authoritative importance, I take the Catechism first, because I regard it as being, for our purpose, of somewhat lower value (in some sense) than other parts of the Prayer Book. The grounds of this opinion will be seen presently. For my plan will be to show:—

I. That as a theological exposition of doctrine, the Catechism possesses an elementary and therefore subsidiary character.

II. That it is historically impossible that the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

III. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject but what is the common language of Reformed Protestants.

IV. That the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

V. That the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the Real Objective Presence.

I. In maintaining the subsidiary character of the teaching of the Catechism, I must not be misunderstood as desiring, in any way, to depreciate the value of this admirable manual of Christian instruction; nor as desiring to shrink, with any

sort of suspicion or dread, from the full force and weight of all that the Catechism teaches on the subject of the Eucharist.

I am well aware, indeed, that it contains that, on which, next perhaps to the notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence have chosen most strongly to entrench themselves. That their hold on the Catechism cannot be maintained, we shall, I think, see presently. Meanwhile, because such a supreme and overriding authority has been claimed for the Catechism, and because I think it not altogether unimportant that our authoritative documents should be set in their natural and true order of relative importance, I deem it right to take up a little time in endeavouring to show what is the true position of the Catechism in relation to our other formularies.

And for this purpose I observe, that at the Savoy Conference, when the Puritans desired to have added to the Catechism, "somewhat[1] particularly concerning the nature of faith, of repentance, the two covenants, of justification, sanctification, adoption and regeneration:" the answer of the bishops was in these words, "The Catechism[2] is not intended as a whole body of divinity, but as a comprehension of the articles of faith, and other doctrines most necessary to salvation; and being short, is fittest for children and common people, and as it was thought sufficient upon mature deliberation, and so it is by us."

I claim for this declaration no sort of authority, I only bring it as evidence that the sanction given to the Catechism was understood to be a sanction for it *as* a Catechism—and as such, as distinct from a whole body of Divinity—because made suitable for childish understandings, and intended to be taught to children by those capable of giving them higher instruction with advancing intelligence; in which, therefore, while we are to expect, indeed, to find Truth and nothing but Truth,[3] yet

[1] See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 327.

[2] See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 358.

[3] This is no question of any attempt to deceive children by "ambiguities of expression." (See Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 237.) It is merely the question of the church's understanding something of the nature and capabilities of children, and having the parental wisdom and tenderness to deal with them accordingly. Our homily which is designed not only to instruct, but to show the need of instruction on the subject says, "We may learn, that both more perfect knowledge is required at this time at our hands, and that the ignorant cannot with fruit and profit exercise himself in the Lord's Sacraments." But it adds, "Neither need we think that such exact knowledge is required of every man, that he be able to discuss all high points in the doctrine thereof." (Pages 397, 398.)

Hammond notes the prudence of our Church in the Catechism "in setting down for all to learn, only those few things which are *necessary* to the plainest and mean-

we should be unreasonable to look for those higher or more advanced teachings by which that Truth might afterwards have to be guarded, and possibly restrained—in short, such theological expositions as we should naturally seek for in Articles of Religion, and which, from their relative position, must necessarily possess, though not higher authority, yet supreme interpretative power and capacity.

The whole of the Catechism, indeed, has now full ecclesiastical sanction. But the very history of the Catechism shews how entirely its character as a Catechism, that is, its rudimentary and elementary character, must be understood to take away from it the power of interpreting other formularies, and to put it into a position in which, so far as it may need exposition, it must receive interpretation from the other utterances of our Church. For, during a period of fifty years, a part of the Catechism was allowed to stand—and the very part which contains this teaching concerning the sacraments—without any proper ecclesiastical authority at all.[1] It was added at the Hampton Court conference.[2] And up to the time of the last review it rested, for its authority, only on the King's Proclamation. And the King's Proclamation, for its authority, rested only on the words of a statute, which statute made provision "that if there shall happen any contempt, or irreverence to be used in the Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, by the misusing of the Orders appointed in this Book (*i.e.* the Book of Common Prayer); the Queen's Majesty may by the like advice of the said Commissioners, or Metropolitan, ordain and publish *such further Ceremonies or Rites*, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His Church,

est." (View of the New Directory; Works, 1684, p. 376. See also Wheatley on Common Prayer, pp. 321, 322. Edit. Oxford, 1846.)

[1] See Nicholls's additional Notes to Common Prayer, pp. 67, 70, and Dr. Nicholls's Preface, pp. vii., viii. Lathbury's History of Convocation, p. 216. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i., pp. 408, 404. Soames's Elizabethan History, pp. 549-551. Blakeney on Common Prayer, pp. 103, 104. Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 225-228. Robertson's "How shall we Conform?" p. 395. Edit. 1869.

[2] The facts of the case are simply these:—The Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth gave authority to the sovereign to ordain and publish "Further Ceremonies or Rites." And the proclamation of King James, authorizing all the alterations or explanations after the Hampton Court Conference, rested only on this concession to the power of the sovereign.

It might have been somewhat of a stretch of this authority, but King James thought himself empowered by it to go so far as to add something to a Catechism for the instruction of children. And the addition was admitted. But assuredly that addition was no new voice—no fresh utterance of the Church.

and the due reverence of Christ's holy Mysteries and Sacraments." (Primo Eliz.)

But certainly this statute gave to the Sovereign no power to touch matters of doctrine.

Clearly, therefore, it could never have been regarded as a new and important doctrinal utterance of the Church of England. Clearly the Reformed Church of England could never have meant to say of that which she allowed to be introduced upon the king's proclamation alone,[1]—"This is a standard[2] of interpretation, by which to correct all private renderings of expressions which I have used elsewhere. In this voice you hear me sitting in judgment on my own formulæ. Listen,[3] for here I give you my full doctrine, completely and definitely. The voice which speaks is not to be explained by the Articles, nor even by the Communion Office, but is itself my own authoritative[4] explanation of them both."

Clearly, by allowing this part of the Catechism thus to be added at first without ecclesiastical authority,[5] and then subsequently giving it her own authority, she recognized as belonging to the Catechism just that elementary and therefore subsidiary character, which naturally and necessarily may be said to belong to it *simply as* a short Catechism.

In such a light therefore we are to regard the Catechism still. This will take away nothing (and I desire to take away nothing) from its full authority. This will take away nothing (and I should be truly sorry to take away anything) from the truth and fulness of its teaching. But it will help to correct the error, of *first* fastening on the words of the Catechism a mis-

[1] See Article xxxvii. Hooker. Edit. Keble, vol. iii., pp. 356, 357, 374, 411, 412, 413, 431, 443, 444. Fulke's Answers, p. 355. Bishop Bilson's "True Difference," etc., pp. 129, 204, 217. Edit. 1585. Courayer on English Orders, pp. 191-197. Edit. Oxford, 1844.

[2] See "Kiss of Peace," pp. 16, 17.

[3] See "Kiss of Peace," p. 23.

[4] See "Kiss of Peace," p. 52.

[5] Mr. Procter says:

"Care was taken to call the alterations by the name of *explanations*, to bring them under the clause in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. . . . We must say, however, that these alterations had the sanction of Convocation, inasmuch as that body allowed this exercise of the prerogative, and ordered the amended book to be provided for the use of the parish churches." ("Procter on Common Prayer," pp. 90, 91.)

It is to be observed, however, that Canon 80 speaks of the Book as "lately *explained* in some few points by *his Majesty's authority*, according to the laws, and *his highness's prerogative* in that behalf." The canon recognizes the changes only as explanations resting on the authority of the king's proclamation. (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 143. Note.)

taken sense—a sense (as we shall see presently) they were never meant to bear—and *then* setting them to work, by means of such mistaken sense, to deprive our other formularies of their true and natural meaning.

It is needless, I think, to dwell longer on this point. I proceed,

II. To show—that it is historically impossible that the teachings of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended, or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

(1) And here, first, I am called upon to clear the ground of an assumption which stands in the way, to the effect that the Catechism must needs teach it, because this addition came from the pen of Bishop Overall.

We are concerned here with what our Church says, and our Catechism teaches, not with the opinions of any one Bishop.

What Overall's views were, seems so immaterial that I hardly like taking up time by entering on the question; but since there seems to be much misapprehension on the subject, and a prevailing suspicion (arising, I suppose, from confident statements) that he held the Real Presence in the sense of the Ritualists; it might seem like shirking a question before us to pass it by.

In allowing myself, however, to be led aside for a little while into this subject, I must be permitted to say that I do so only under protest, that the call to touch at all on this point can only arise from a prevailing notion of its having some important bearing on the controversy before us, which notion, I am persuaded, ought to be regarded as nothing better than an entire misconception.

The evidence on which the confidence as to Overall's opinions has been made to rest, is derived (as far as I can learn) from three sources, (1) from[1] a letter to Grotius; (2) from additional notes in Nicholls's Common Prayer; (3) from a quotation in Knox's Remains.

[1] This was quoted in Archdeacon Denison's Defence, as saying, "There are certain zealots who condemn the practice of our Church in receiving the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ kneeling, or at least object to His worship and reservation." The Latin is "Morem ecclesiæ nostræ sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi de geniculis accipiendi oppugnant, aut eum saltem colere et custodire recusant;" which simply means, "They oppose our Church's custom of receiving the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ on the knees, or at least refuse to observe and keep it, (*i.e.* our Church's custom)." (See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 830.)

(1) As to the *first*, I suppose all claim to it is now given up, for it has been shown that the argument rests entirely on a mistaken translation.

(2) As to the *second*. The notes were not written by Bishop Overall.[1]

(3) As to the *third*. The quotation in Knox, (exactly as it stands) has never, as far as I know, been verified. But there is a MS., discovered by Dean Goode, in the British Museum, containing an account of the matter which Knox refers to, *drawn up by Overall himself*.

I have examined this MS., and while I admit that it con-

[1] The Title of these Notes is this, "Additional Notes on the Common Prayer. Many of which are *supposed* to have been *collected* by the Right Reverend Dr. John Overall, formerly Lord Bishop of Norwich, etc., etc." Then in the next pages is "An Explication of the Marks in the Additional Notes," in which are specified *six* marks, which are found attached to the various notes. And the "Explication" of the mark *† is given thus, "Signifies MSS. Notes written in an interleaved Common Prayer Book, in the Bishop of Durham's Library, printed in the year 1619. *Supposed* to be made from the *Collections* of Bishop *Overall*, by a Friend or Chaplain of his: a copy of which MSS. is in the hands of the Reverend Dr. Hickes, some part thereof being printed by him, in his Preface to his Christian Priesthood." I quote from edition of 1712.

That these notes were certainly not written by Overall, is proved by the references made to Overall by name, ("My Lord Overall"). Dean Goode considered they were certainly not Cosin's, as being of a different character from his.

The editor of vol. v. of Cosin's works in the Anglo-Catholic Library, regards them as certainly Cosin's, considering "the hand-writing" of the MSS. to be "quite decisive." (Pref. p. xiii.) And acknowledging the difference in the tone from his later notes, which, indeed, is very obvious, (p. xvi.) he considers "the marked contrast" (p. xix.) to "illustrate the apparent change in Cosin's views."

If it must be admitted that the notes truly represent what once were Cosin's views, they are not without their value, as bearing witness to the fact of Cosin's having at an earlier period of his life entertained opinions, which gave way before a maturer judgment, and a more familiar acquaintance with the Romish Controversy, and with the real teaching of the Romish Church.

Possibly, taking into account the complete want of harmony with Cosin's later writings, and the acknowledged "great difference between the early and later handwriting of Bishop Cosin," some may consider the evidence of Cosin's authorship not yet so full and conclusive as to leave absolutely no room for question. (See Bishop Ollivant's Charge, 1869, pp. 128, 137.) There are, however, a few notes in this series which seem to me less unlike Cosin's other notes. (See *e.g.* Nicholls's additional notes, p. 46.) But, be this as it may, all that can be urged in favour of the supposition that Overall's views may be reflected in this series, rests, it appears, only on conjectural deductions from the references to Overall's name, and the fact of the writer being Overall's chaplain, and (if Cosin) a young man, at the date (1619) of the *printing* of the interleaved book. (See Keble, Eucharistic Adoration, p. 155. Edit. 1867.) It is to be observed, however, that the notes are largely made up of *collections and translations;* (see Editor's Preface to Vol. v. of Cosin's Works, Anglo-Cath. Library, p. xvii. and xv.) while their dates range (probably) from 1619 to about 1638. (See Ibid. p. xviii.) And, this being so, it must be admitted, I think, that the true controversial value of these notes, as bearing on the question before us, is either *nil*, or something very small indeed.

tains evidence of some peculiar views,[1] I believe that it could never have been written by one holding the doctrines now held by the Ritualists. Indeed, there are expressions which, it will be acknowledged, I think, must be regarded as quite decisive on this matter.[2]

[1] Chiefly, perhaps, in maintaining the words, "Hoc est corpus meum"—"locutionem esse propriam, non autem tropicam."

This, however, is maintained also by Brevint; and that, in a work ("The Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," chap. xiii.) which will sufficiently show how distinctly opposed were Brevint's views to "the Real Objective Presence." Brevint regards the Reformers' sense of the words as "full and literal," (p. 211. Edit. Oxford, 1673) and that of the Papists as having "many unusual and strange *tropes* or *figures*," or "tortures," (pp. 212, 221).

Moreover Overall evidently distinguishes his own "Real Presence" from the Presence, "Qualem Pontificii statuerunt," (p. 24). The MS. is among the Harleian MSS., No. 3142.

He maintains that "Mahomedan sive Turcam, et Papam Romanum simul constituere Anti-christum est verisimile" (p. 39).

[2] He says that the Fathers taught "non esse hic nudam figuram, et nuda signa, sed veram esse præsentiam et communicationem Christi, licet modus non esset corporalis, sed spiritualis et cœlestis."

He complains of those "*qui divulgarunt me in comitiis, corporalem modum Christi præsentiæ in Sacramento, et justificationem per justitiam inhærentem defendisse ac docuisse; cum hisce de rebus sæpius in scholis sententiam nostræ ecclesiæ orthodoxam constanter docuerim.* In Sacramento Eucharistiæ sive cœnæ dominicæ, Christi corpus et sanguinem totumque adeo Christum, vere quidem adesse, et vere a nobis participari, vereque conjungi cum signis sacramentalibus, ut cum signis non solum significativis sed et etiam exhibitivis, ita ut in recto *usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus*, dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur corpus Christi; dato et accepto vino, detur et accipiatur sanguis Christi, totusque adeo Christus in sacramenti communione communicetur, sed ut non modo corporali, crasso, terreno; per transubstantiationem aut consubstantiationem, similiave rationis humanæ commenta; sed in modo mystico, cœlesti, ac spirituali, ut recte in articulis nostris præscriptum est. *Similiter justitiam qua justificamur coram Deo, esse solam Christi obedientiam, nobis pœnitentibus, et in Christum credentibus, gratis per fidem imputatam.*" (Pages 24, 25.)

It may be observed, that the quotation in Knox's Remains (vol. ii., pp. 181, 182; Edit. 1844) agrees *verbatim*, and almost *literatim* [the "*cœnæ dominicæ*" in the first line is "*cœna dominica*" in Knox] with the greater part of this extract (the part *not* printed in italics), except that in Knox the words "*usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus*" are omitted, and that, following the omission, "*recto*" is necessarily read "*recte;*" so that the words run "*ita ut in recte dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur corpus Christi.*"

The fact that the word *dato* (the first word after the omission) is, in the MS., the first word of a new line, added to the close correspondence of the rest of the citation, leads naturally to the conjecture that this very MS. furnished Knox with the quotation, and that, in copying, he accidentally omitted a few words. I submit to the judgment of others, that the words in Knox *sound* very much as if *there were* some omission. Should we not otherwise expect, at least, to have the word "*in*," if not the words "*in recte*," before "*dato et accepto vino*"? The sentence seems to go halting somewhere. The MS. seems to me just to supply, what the quotation in Knox appears to need, to make it read smoothly. The accidental omission, however, (if my conjecture is right) makes a most important change in the doctrinal sound of the statement.

Of Overall's words as quoted by Knox, the Bishop Llandaff observes (Charge,

The *Presence* he contends for is a Presence to *worthy* receivers, it depends on the operation of the Holy Spirit working

1869, p. 138):—"What words could possibly express more clearly, that the giving and receiving of the body and blood of Christ requires, at least as one condition, that they should be *rightly, i.e., faithfully received* by the communicant? It is monstrous to suppose that the *recte accepto* can include all, worthy and unworthy. If these, then, were Overall's words, they show with how little justice he can be claimed as an advocate of the notion that our Lord's body and blood can be in the hand of every receiver." Much more forcibly might the like assertion be made of Overall's words as they appear in the MS.

Overall's conclusion is this:—

"In sacramenta Eucharistiæ corpus et sanguis Christi, totusque adeo Christus adhibetur *digne recipientibus* non per modum transubstantionis, nec per modum consubstantionis, sed *Spiritu Sancto per fidem operante.*"

These last words are quoted by Dean Goode, who adds, "Could I wish for a more satisfactory statement of his doctrine?" ("On Eucharist," p. 830.) The statement indeed corresponds exactly with Nowell's Catechism, "When we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the divine nourishment *of His body and blood* . . . given to *us* by the *work of the Holy Ghost*, and received of us *by faith*," and with the words of the Homily, "The Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation which by the *operation of the Holy Ghost* . . . is through *faith wrought in the souls of the faithful.*"

The same teaching is found also in Beza:—"Id fit . . . sola Spiritus sancti potentia et virtute, qui efficit ut ille ipse Jesus Christus . . . nobis qui in terris sumus, non minus verè donetur quâm signa ipsa." (Tract. Theol.; Geneva, 1582; vol. i., p. 28.) "Hinc consequitur, rem ipsam Sacramentorum . . . ab eo verè percipi qui veram fidem afferat, idque non dentibus, aut ventre, aut ullo *crasso et coporali modo* . . . sed *spirituali modo per fidem*, eoque non minus certo et efficaci quam si naturalis esset." (Ibid.) Again:—"Minime ambigimus quin, sicut ordinationis verba testantur, *verum corpus*, et *verus sanguis Domini*, id est, ipse Jesus Christus cum omnibus suis opibus, *verè et sine ullâ fraude offeratur*, non ore, *sed fide, per Spiritus sancti efficaciam* percipiendus ad vitam æternam, idque non minus verè quam corporeis nostris sensibus offeruntur panis et vinum, quæ propterea etiam vocantur corpus et sanguis Jesu Christi, quoniam videlicit certæ sunt notæ, et tessaræ visibiles et corporeæ earum rerum quas nobis Dominus *spiritualiter offert, id est, veri corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi.*" (Page 30.) Again:—"Quemadmodum igitur naturali modo *accipimus, edimus et bibimus* naturalia symbola, quæ postea virtute naturalis facultatis in nostram substantiam coalescunt: *ita* etiam *cœlesti et spirituali modo* Jesus Christus . . . verè nobis communicatur, ut simus caro ex carne ejus, et ossa de ipsius ossibus." (Page 31.)

Moreover Beza quotes from Zwingle, as teaching the same doctrine:—"*Asserimus, inquit, non sic carnaliter et crasse manducari corpus Christi, ut isti perhibent, sed verum Christi corpus credimus in cœna sacramentaliter* (id est, sumpto panis symbolo) *et spiritualiter* (id est, non dentibus vel ore, neque naturali modo, sed fide et Spiritus sancti virtute) *edi a religiosa, fideli et sancta mente.* Hæc sunt ipsius Zuinglii verba." (Tract Theol., vol. i., p. 222. See pp. 228, 260, 279, vol. ii., pp. 126-144; and Hospinian, Works, vol. iv., p. 241. Genev; 1681.)

It may be interesting further to remark, the very close resemblance of Overall's words and teaching to the words and teaching of Archbishop Ussher:—"Neither are they to be accounted barely *significative*, but truly *exhibitive* also, of those heavenly things whereto they have relation. . . . So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man receiveth the earthly creature, so verily doth he . . . receive the body and blood of Christ." (Ussher's Works, vol. ii., p. 429. The whole passage will be found quoted below, p. 266.) To the same purpose, Willet says:—"The death of Christ . . . is not only *represented*, but *exhibited* also. . . . His blood is not present only in *signification*, but *verily and indeed* to the *worthy*

by faith in the heart, and it is expressly distinguished *as to the mode*, from the Lutheran *Consubstantiation*, as well as from the Romish Transubstantiation. Indeed the language in which he sums up the doctrine he maintains is language in perfect conformity with that used by earlier English Divines, whose views are distinctly in opposition to the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence: but it is language totally at variance with that of those who now teach the Real Objective Presence, and most clearly I think, indicates views which are quite irreconcileable with their doctrine.

But besides this, let me observe, that in the year 1609 there was issued a new edition of Jewel's works, with a dedicatory preface addressed to James I.

This dedication, we are told, came from the pen of Overall.[1] But the writer of this dedication, is one who would seem to put himself in the theological school of Jewel—and speaks of Jewel's writings in defence of the doctrine of the Church of England[2] in a way which he could hardly have done, if he had held any such doctrine as the Real Objective Presence.

On the whole, I admit, that Overall was not without some peculiarities of opinion, sufficient, perhaps, to justify the cautionary voice of Archbishop Whitgift.[3] He seems[4] to me, as

receiver." (Synopsis Papismi, vol. v., p. 280. See also Bucer as quoted below, p. 264.)

[1] See Jewel's Works, "Defence of Apology," etc., P. S. Edit., p. 1306.

[2] Witness such words as these, "Touching many of which superstitious errors, even the chiefest of them (the same being controverted betwixt us and the Church of Rome), they are discussed in the books ensuing: and OUR DOCTRINE IS THEREIN JUSTIFIED against the papists by the certain testimonies of the fathers and constant judgment of antiquity." (In Jewel's Works, P. S. Edit., iv., p. 1309.)

Is it conceivable that any one acquainted with Jewel's writings "On the Real Presence," could have expressed himself thus, if he had held the doctrine of our opponents? (See also Martin's Reply to Bp. of Salisbury, p. 148.)

[3] "I have received your letters touching Mr. Overall, and I very much rely upon your judgment in that case. Nevertheless I am informed by some others that Mr. Overall is something factious and inclined to that sect, that loveth to pick quarrels to the present state and government of the Church; which I hope not to be true because of your commendation." (Whitgift's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 615. See Strype's Whitgift, book iv., ch. xix., pp. 480-1.)

[4] I desire to speak not without some diffidence and hesitation on a matter, the evidence for which is somewhat scanty and uncertain.

Hardwick says, (Reformation, p. 263,) "Without materially receding from the principles of St. Augustine, or exposing himself to the reproach of semi-Pelagianism, he advocated doctrines virtually extruded from the Calvinistic system." In the matter of his habitual disregard of Rubric, and dislocating a prayer in the Communion Service, (see in Additional Notes to Nicholls's Common Prayer, p. 49,) he went further than any, I hope, were willing to follow him.

Overall appears to have had some share in some part of Francis Mason's writings on the Validity of Ordinations. From which some sort of presumption will arise that his views on Ordination were similar.

far as we have the means of judging, to stand probably on a sort of stepping-stone between the doctrine of the Reformers and the unhappy innovations of Laud's school.

I will not venture to say how far the following quotations may justify the inference that Overall held the validity of foreign non-episcopal ordinations. "Out of a letter of Geo. Davenport to Mr. Sandcroft from Paris, Jan., 1655: 'I have learned of him (viz., the Dean of Peterborough, Dr. Cosin, whose chaplain I think he was) that the book wherein the ordination of the French Church is vindicated, was made by Bishop Overall, (with whom the dean then lived) and not by Mr. Mason. Mr. Mason, indeed, added something to it with the approbation of the bishop, and printed it in his own name, at the desire of the bishop.'

"In another letter, dated Aug. 6, he saith, 'I must undeceive you about the additionals to Mr. Mason, for he (the dean) saith, he said that the bishop was the chief composer of the first draught of the book de Minist. Anglican. in English, which was printed by the King's printer.' Tanner." (Note in Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, under Francis Mason, Edit. Bliss, 1815, vol. ii., p. 307.)

"That book entitled 'The Defence of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, maintained by Mr. Archdeacon Mason, against the Romanists, is sufficiently known, and I have been assured it was not only the judgment of Bishop Overall, but that he had a principal hand in it. *Healing Attempt*, etc., 4to, 1689, p. 62, penes me. W. K. KENNET." (Ibid. p. 306).

Hallam considers the Divine right of episcopacy to be expressed in Overall's "Convocation Book." (See Constitutional History, vol. i., p. 396, note, Edit. 1867.) But Overall was not *the Author* of the "Convocation Book:" and the doctrine is there, I think, scarcely so strongly, and distinctly, and exclusively asserted as to leave no room for Bishop Hall's distinction "betwixt the being and the well-being of a Church." Bishop Andrewes says, "If our form be of Divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is not salvation without it, or that a Church cannot stand without it." (See Opuscula, Anglo-Cath. Libr., p. 191.) Archbishop Bramhall says, "Episcopal divines do not deny those Churches to be true Churches." (Bramhall's Works; Anglo-Cath. Libr., vol. iii., p. 518.) With such limitations the doctrine may be said to be taught in Mason's work also. (See "Whose are the Fathers?" Longmans: pp. 689 and 358.)

Certainly, if the corrected statement of Davenport be true, and if we are to understand from it that Overall's *sacramental views* were embodied in Mason's work, we could hardly desire better evidence of Overall's *not holding* anything like the Real Objective Presence, as the following extracts from the "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ" will be acknowledged (I think) sufficiently to shew:—

"Si Sacerdotis vocabulo nihil aliud significasses, quam Ministrum Evangelicum. Cui Verbi et Sacramentorum commissa est dispensatio; hoc sensu nos omnes esse Sacerdotes palam profiteremur. . . . Qui verbum vitæ annunciant, non inconcinnè Sacerdotes dici possunt, quia spirituali gladio homines mactant, et immolant Deo." (Edit. 1625, pp. 543, 544, lib. v., cap. 1.)

"Si sacrificium missæ sit propitiatorium, erit cruentum. Nam *sine sanguinis* effusione non fit remissio. At Papistæ negant, sacrificium missaticum esse cruentum: ergo non erit propitiatorium." (Ibid. p. 553, lib. v., cap. 2.)

"Circumcisio est fœdus, Agnus est transitus, Calix est novum Testamentum. Quocirca cum dicitur, Hoc est corpus meum, ipsa analogia demonstrat, hæc verba *figuratè* et *sacramentaliter* esse accipienda. Quasi dictum esset, Hoc quod in manibus habeo, id est, his panis, est corpus meum, id est, *corporis mei* SIGNUM *et* SIGILLUM." (Ibid. p. 603, lib. v., cap. 6.)

"Rex demonstrat se hoc sigillo illum in actualem castelli possessionem mittere. Eodem planè modo Dominus noster Jesus Christus, quamvis dicere potuisset, Hoc significat corpus meum, vel, Hoc est corporis mei sacramentum, maluit tamen dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum*, ut cor fidele gaudio (ut ita dicam) magis cordiali impleret, nos certificans, se dum panem donat, seipsum etiam donare, et exhibere,

But as Laud [1] himself never attained to the teaching of anything like the doctrine now taught as the Real Objective Presence, so, I feel strongly persuaded, that Overall also was far from it, though he may have made approaches, more or less considerable, in that direction.

But what have Overall's peculiar sentiments to do with the matter before us? Granted that he may have penned the addition to the Catechism, does it follow that his peculiarities are embodied in the addition?

Certainly not. There were other bishops at the conference who would certainly have taken care that there should be nothing inserted but what should be approved by themselves. The hand and the head which was employed in framing the epitome is of no more real importance than the very pen that wrote it.

The language (as we have to do with it) is the language of the Church not of any individual Doctor. And it is to be interpreted in its *natural sense* according to the usage of the time, and in harmony with the language of our other formularies.

The answer in the Catechism, which is now alleged as teaching the Real Objective Presence, is this—"The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." But this answer appears, in fact, to be almost entirely a compilation from Nowell's Catechism.[2] And we may rest assured there went forth from

nosque in actualem gratiarum et beneficiorum sanguine suo nobis partorum possessionem introducere." (Ibid. p. 613, lib. v., cap. 6.)

"Mensam Domini Apostolus nec Altare vocat, nec cum Altari comparat; sed comparat communionem Eucharistiæ cum communione Altaris." (Ibid. p. 624, lib. v., cap. 8.)

"Non hic (Heb. xiii. 10) agitur de Eucharistia, sed de passione Christi extra portam." (Ibid. p. 625, lib. v., cap. 8.)

"In novo [Testamento] . . . nullum est sacrificium propriè dictum, præter unicum sacrificium crucis. Quocirca, quod ab hoc sacrificio est diversum, novi Testamenti Sacrificium esse non potest. Quicquid autem sacrificii crucis est commemoratio vel repræsentatio, illud ab hoc est diversum (nihil enim sui ipsius est commemoratio vel repræsentatio:) Quicquid igitur est sacrificii crucis commemoratio, vel repræsentatio, illud novi Testamenti sacrificium esse non potest." (Ibid. p. 627, lib. v., cap. 9.)

"Quum vestra Missificatio neque in Scripturis, neque in Patribus rectè intellectis fundetur, sed utrisque repugnet, eandem ut sacrilegam, et blasphemam, et pretiosissimo Christi sacrificio derogantem jure abominamur. Nam Christus solus est noster Pontifex, qui unicâ oblatione sanctuarium ingressus, et æternam redemptionem pro nobis nactus est." (Ibid. p. 631, lib. v., cap. 9.)

[1] See Appendix, Note A.

[2] The following in Nowell's Smallest Catechism is *one* answer, which in our Church Catechism is broken into *two*. (See "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 188.)

"The Body and Blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them *taken*, *eaten*, and *drunken*, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth: so, that is, that like as bread nourishes our bodies, so also

the Hampton Court Conference nothing in this answer which had not the sanction of the other bishops[1] and divines; nay, more, nothing but what met with the hearty approval of the great body of orthodox English Protestants both Conformist and Non-conformist.

Thus the way being clear for us, we have now to enter (2) upon our historical argument.

The Conference at Hampton Court, at which this addition concerning the Sacraments was added was held for the purpose of conciliating the Puritans. This addition itself was made to meet the views of the Puritans,[2] and the general result of the

the *body* of Christ *nourishes* our *souls* spiritually through faith; and like as the hearts of men are cheered by wine, and their strength confirmed, so our *souls* are *refreshed* and *renewed* by the *blood* of Christ through faith; in which way *the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper.* For Christ as surely makes *those* who *trust in Him partakers of His body and blood*, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

Bishop Jacobson says, "The first part of this Smaller Catechism agrees exactly with that given in the two Liturgies of King Edward VI., and the additions made by Bishop Overall, after the Hampton Court Conference, were evidently abridged from it." (Preface to Nowell's Catechism, pp. xxxv., xxxvi.) Others have supposed that Overall made use of some Latin formula, probably "an ancient 'A. B. C. with the Catechism,' of unknown authorship." (See J. H. Blunt's Common Prayer, p. 242.)

The Latin of this Catechism not being given, we are unable to compare it with the addition of Overall. It may be interesting to observe, however, that the teaching of our Catechism on the Lord's Supper presents a striking contrast to that of the Catechism prefixed to Dean Colet's "Latin Accidence" for the use of "lytel babys and lytel children." In this we have the words, "By gracyous Eucharistye where is ye very presence of the persone of Christ under forme of breed, we be noureshed spiritually in God." (See Lufton's Introduction to Dean Colet's "Treatise on the Sacraments," pp. 22, 19.)

[1] Wheatly says, "King James I. appointed the *bishops* to add a short and plain explanation; which was done . . . being *penned* by Bishop Overall, . . . and *allowed by the bishops.*" (On Common Prayer, p. 322. Edit. Oxford, 1846.) And let it be remembered that among the Bishops at the Hampton Court Conference were Archbishop Whitgift, who declared that this Church of England *has refused* "the Real Presence," (see above, Paper No. I., pp. 18, 19); and Bishop Bilson, who taught that "your Real Presence and ubiquity . . . are the very bowels and inwards of Eutyches' heresy." (See above, Paper III., pp. 70, 71.) Were these men such unfaithful guardians of our Church's doctrine, or such ignorant and unpractised Divines, as to let pass unchallenged an answer in the Catechism, which was really and designedly bringing back into our camp, what had before been cast out as unclean?

[2] At the Conference "Dr. Reynolds complained the Catechism in the Common Prayer was too short, and the supplemental one drawn up by Nowell . . . too long for children to get by heart. He desired, therefore, an uniform Catechism might be made for general use." (Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., p. 284.) So Neal says "The Doctor . . . desired a new Catechism, to which the king consented." ("History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 399. See also Soames's "Elizabethan History," p. 538.)

At the Savoy Conference the Puritans, so far from making any objection to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper, express a kind of special

Conference was regarded as a concession to the Puritans so far as it went.[1] So that the king, anxious not to seem to have gone too far in the way of yielding, was careful to make it understood that the matters conceded were not important, and were rather explanations than alterations.[2]

It was, indeed, at first thought, that the concessions were more important than they afterwards[3] proved, and hence arose some considerable disappointment and discontent. No doubt, also, there were exceptions subsequently taken to some particulars contained in the part added to the Catechism. And in respect of the most important of these an alteration was made at the last Review to meet the views of the Puritans. But still, on the whole, what was done at the Hampton Court Conference, including this addition to the Catechism, was understood to be, *so far*, a yielding to the desires of the complain-

commendation of the addition made at the Hampton Court Conference, "as being more fully and particularly delivered than the other parts of the Catechism, in short answers fitted to the memories of children," desiring that it might be as a model for "a more distinct and full explication of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer." (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 327.)

Bishop Cosin says:—

"In the Conference at Hampton Court, great complaint was made by the ministers there, that this public short Catechism was defective in the point of the Sacraments; whereupon it was ordered, that the Bishops should make an addition, and so they did; which by King James his authority only, was annexed to the former Catechism, which ended after the answer following the Lord's Prayer. The addition was first penned by Bishop Overall (then Dean of Paul's), and allowed by the Bishops." (Bishop Cosin in Nicholls's Additional Notes to Common Prayer, p. 58.)

An argument has sometimes been urged in favour of the Real Objective Presence from the *amount* of teaching which the Catechism contains, on the subject of the Sacraments. But (not to mention the Assembly's Catechisms and Nowell's) might not the same argument apply equally to the Catechism of Beza? (See his Tract. Theol., vol. i., p. 693.) Nowell's Smallest Catechism (the English copy) *differs* almost *only*, in having the part on the Sacrament *more* "*full* and *copious*." (See Jacobson's Preface, pp. xxxiv., xxxvi.)

[1] Soames says:—"It was, therefore, very far from the fruitless mockery of just expectations which has often passed for its real character. On the contrary, every objection, really found tenable, met a suitable remedy; and a discussion that left the Church of England very much as we now find it, proved how little ground of exception could be taken to its formularies by scholarly and moderate men." ("Elizabethan History," p. 552.)

[2] The king's proclamation sets forth that "Notwithstanding the consent of the bishops and other learned men, some passages were rather explained than altered; yet, with reasonable construction every thing might very well have stood in its former condition." (See Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., p. 301.)

[3] For the news had been given out that the Nonconformists had gained "an absolute victory;" that the king gratified Dr. Rainolds in every thing desired; that greater things were yet to be expected; that the king "treated the bishop ruggedly," but was "kind and caressing to Dr. Rainolds." (See Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., p. 306. Hallam's "Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 297. Edit. 1867.)

ants.[1] And, as the result of this we are told of Rainolds,[2] and the other agents for the Nonconformists that, (after hearing read "the few alterations, or rather explanations, of the Common Prayer agreed by the king and the bishops,") "they assented, seemed satisfied with the result of the Conference, and promised to regard the bishops as their spiritual fathers, and perform all duty to them."[3]

We are told also of another[4] eminent Nonconformist, who,

[1] L'Estrange, maintaining the authority of the changes made by King James's Proclamation, as being made "by Act of Parliament, *reductive* and *implied*," alleges against the proclamation losing its vigour by the king's death, that his late majesty "did not null it by any express edict; that several parliaments sitting after did not disallow it; that all subscriptions have been unanimous in reference to those changes; that THE EMENDATIONS WERE *made to* SATISFY THE LITIGANT PARTY." (Alliance of Divine Offices. Oxford Edit., p. 38.)

[2] Of Rainolds Collier says that:—"Notwithstanding his appearing for the Dissenters at the Hampton Court Conference, he conformed himself to the Church ceremonies." ("Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., p. 341.) Neal calls him "The oracle of his time for acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History, Councils, and Fathers." (Vol. i., p. 402.) But says, that on this occasion he "fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the Puritans, being overawed by the place and company, and the arbitrary dictates of his sovereign opponent." (Page 403.) Hallam says that Rainolds "was nearly, or if not altogether, the most learned man in England. He was censured by his faction for making a weak defence; but the king's partiality and intemperance plead his apology." ("Constitutional History," vol. i., p. 297. Edit. 1867.)

"He [Rainolds] was a person of 'prodigious reading and doctrine, and the very treasury of Erudition. . . . He was a living library, and a third university. . . . The memory and reading of that man were near to a miracle." (Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., pp. 13, 14.) "As his memory was a faithful *index*, so his reason was a solid *judex* of what he read. . . . *Incertum est utrum doctior an melior.*" (Fuller's "Church History," vol. iii., p. 231.) Crakanthorp says he had in his possession a letter from Rainolds to Archbishop Bancroft "in qua se huic Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ conformen esse, libenter et ex animo, etiam conscientia sua sic eum monente ultro profitetur." (See Note in Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii., p. 14. Edit. Bliss.)

[3] See Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., pp. 298-9.

Dr. Montague says that "Dr. Reynolds and the rest were all exceedingly well satisfied." (See note in Perry's "History of the Church of England," vol. i., p. 102.) The King's Proclamation says, "The issue was, that no well-grounded matter appeared to us or our said Council, why the state of the Church here by law established, should in any material point be altered. Nor did those that before had seemed to affect such alteration, when they heard the contrary arguments, greatly insist upon it, but seemed to be satisfied themselves, and to undertake within reasonable time to satisfy all others, that were misled with opinion that there was any just cause of alteration." (See Cardwell's Doc. Annals, vol. ii., p. 61.)

"Dr. Sparks is said to have been converted by the advocates of conformity, as he shortly afterwards proved by setting forth a treatise on unity and conformity." (Perry's "History of the Church of England," vol. i., p. 103. See Fuller's "Church History," vol. iii., p. 192. Edit. 1837.)

[4] This was Dr. Burgess. He had resigned his benefice rather than sign the three articles of the 36th Canon. "The king," says Collier, "did him the honour of a personal conference, and here the matter in question being discussed, Burgess was gained to an entire conformity, and returned to his station. After this he

shortly after this, (I do not say in consequence of this), from an opponent, became a warm supporter of the Church of England. Was this addition then regarded as teaching a doctrine which Puritans held in abhorrence? Clearly not.[1] Puritans were not slow to point out what they regarded as blemishes. Can any example be found of any eminent Puritan Divine who charged the Church Catechism with teaching the doctrine of Luther?

Nonconformists I believe now, some of them at least, are not slow to condemn this answer in our Catechism. But is there any one instance[2] to be shown of any Nonconformist

signalized himself against the Dissenters, and became a champion for the government and ceremonies of the Established Church." ("Ecclesiastical History," vol. vii., p. 312. See Neal's "History of the Puritans," vol. i., p. 430.)

Dr. Burgess published (1631) an "Answer rejoyned to Reply to Dr. Morton." This book has reference chiefly to the question of ceremonies. It makes frequent reference to the Puritan "Abridgment." But it takes no notice, I think, of any objection to the words of the Catechism.

The same may be said of the following publication: "Reasons shewing that there is no need of such a Reformation of the public, 1. Doctrine, 2. Worship, 3. Rites and Ceremonies, 4. Church-government, 5. Discipline as is pretended, etc., H. S., D.D., Chaplain to his Majestie in Ordinary, 1660." This book takes notice of several objections to the Common Prayer, but of none touching this answer in the Catechism.

It may be said, too, I think, of all Bishop Hall's writings against Puritan objections, (1) "The Common Apology of the Church of England," (2) "Humble Remonstrance," (3) "Defence of the Humble Remonstrance," (4) "Short Answer to the tedious Vindication of Smectymnus," (5) "For Episcopacy and the Liturgy," —that we should not infer from them that Bishop Hall knew of any objection made to the words of the Catechism. Yet he makes special reference to the "Alterations and additions." (See Works, vol. ix., p. 646. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Other books also, written in defence of the Prayer Book against the Puritans (with the exception of Ambrose Fisher's which will be quoted below, p. 232), so far as I have had opportunities of examining them, furnish no instance of any notice taken of any exception to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

[1] So among the concessions proposed by the committee of 1641, we find it suggested, "Whether the Catechism may not receive a little more enlargement." But there is no suggestion for any change in the words of this answer. (See Cardwell's Conferences, p. 276.)

[2] The question is limited to Puritan Divines of *eminence*. Exceptional cases may doubtless be produced from obscurer quarters. It would have been strange indeed if the tendency to find blots everywhere suffered this answer to pass altogether without accusation.

Appended to Nicholls's Common Prayer (Edit. 1712) is "An Introduction to the Liturgy of the Church of England: written by way of Preface before Archbishop Laud's Collection of Various Readings out of the several Ancient Common-Prayer Books." And of this, the 8th Chapter contains, "Further Exceptions taken against the Book of Common Prayer, and Communion-Book of Ordination, allowed by the Church of England. With reasons exhibited to the Bishop of Exon, by some Ministers of his Diocese, for their Refusal of Subscription to the Book of Common Prayer; with Brief Answers thereunto, made by Mr. Tho: Hutton. Printed Anno Dom: 1606." This paper contains some curious objections, and among them are *three* exceptions taken against the Catechism.

theologian of learning and authority, uttering one word of objection to this, for many years after it was published and set forth?

(1) The first is the common one against the words as they then stood:—"They do perform it by their Sureties."

(2) The second is against the words, "*generally* necessary," and argues that the word "generally," importeth other and more Sacraments; in particular implying the Popish Sacraments.

The following is part of the "answer" which may be worth noting:—

"The word *as*, is as a partition wall betwixt the Sacraments and Generally, giving a reason why two Sacraments are received, and no more. There are two sacraments as *generally necessary* in a signification taken at large, meaning no more, because naming no more but two, and these two not *simply* and *absolutely* necessary, as if a Christian were damned without them; but as GENERALLY *necessary*, that is, when they may be had according to Christ's Institution."

(3) The *third* exception is taken to the answer before us, which it says, "savours too much of Transubstantiation; and is against the 28th Article, which saith, *they are taken after a spiritual manner by the faithful*." The "answer" to this exception is specially worthy of attention. I will give it entire:—"In this sentence it is set down a difference between *Anabaptists* and *Papists;* the one making them *bare and naked Signs;* the other the *real and corporal Presence*. Here one clause distinguisheth both dangerous opinions (*the Body and Blood of Christ verily and indeed*). So then not only bare and naked Signs (*are taken and received*). So then not (*are* only), as if there was a Stop and Breath (but *are taken and reeeived*), to shew they are not if out of use, and out of use if not (*taken, and taken and received of the faithful*) as if NO FAITH, then *verily and indeed* NO BODY NOR BLOOD OF CHRIST: *of the faithful*, to distinguish from that FALSEHOOD which teacheth the BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST ARE VERILY AND INDEED used or not used, *be the party* FAITHFUL OR NOT FAITHFUL. *Verily and indeed*, the words they stick at, savour as much of Transubstantiation as Mr. Calvin's words, speaking of the elements, saith, 'They are not bare signs, but joined to their truth and substance; neither must the Sacraments, by any means, be separated from their truth and substance.'"

I think it will be found that Neal, in his "History of the Puritans," takes no account of the "exhibition" of these "*reasons*," and makes no mention (I think) of these "*exceptions*."

The "answer," as quoted above, may surely be taken as adding somewhat of valuable testimony to the position maintained in the text, as shewing clearly the sense in which the language of the Catechism was understood, and the grounds on which it was maintained and defended, by what may be called the High Church Theology of the period. There is obviously no room here for the "Real Objective" theory.

The same may be said of the answer to the objection put into the mouth of the Puritans in Fisher's "Defence of the Liturgy." (See below, p. 232.)

I must not, of course, be understood to deny the possibility of other exceptional examples being found of Puritan objections to the words of the answer in the Catechism.

But when all that may be found shall be put together, I do question whether they will carry sufficient weight to break the force of the argument in the text, or even materially to deduct from its value.

In the general silence of Puritans on this point, there is an acquiescence in, and assent to the soundness of the doctrine herein taught, such as must, I think, clear the answer from having, in the language of the period, anything of a really Lutheran character. Their feeling, in regard of the Hampton Court Conference, appears to have been, that in the changes made were concessions paltry and insufficient; and that they had ground of complaint in the refusal of larger and more important alterations; *not* that occasion had been taken for the added injury of introducing a doctrine which they regarded with the strongest repugnance.

How are we to account for the absence of all condemnation or censure of this answer from Puritan Divines of note and esteem? How comes it, that the loud cry of complaint is hushed before these words of our Catechism, or taken up by some few and feeble voices, which serve only to make more striking the general silence?

In the year 1606, was published a book entitled, "A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer." To this book there are frequent references made in Bishop Cosin's first series of notes on the Prayer Book, which has commonly passed under the name of Overall. This is said to be "apparently one of the most systematic and authoritative collections of the objections of the Puritans."[1] But in this there is no exception[2] taken to this answer in the Catechism.

When the Dissentients at Conference at Savoy, in 1662, sent in their long paper of grievances, and going through the whole Prayer Book, laid their fingers on every word and expression in which they thought might be found a blot[3]—how is it to be accounted for, that while commenting freely on the Catechism, and passing under review its several parts, the answer which contains the teaching which is alleged to be the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, is passed by without one word of objection, without one syllable of criticism, without so much as a suggestion that the words might be more cautiously expressed, without even a whisper that it might be framed more to their mind? And yet, if they had seen lurking here but the trace of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence, all their other objections, even the whole sum of all their matters of complaint, would have sunk into insignificance beside it. Did

Neal himself writes very sorely concerning the Hampton Court Conference, saying:—"Thus ended this mock Conference, for it deserves no better name." (Vol. i., p. 402.) He speaks of "the few alterations or explanations" as "not answering the expectations" of the Puritan divines. But he does not seem to have any word of objection to make either to this addition to the Catechism or to any other of the explanations.

"The alterations were wholly immaterial; the most important being an explanatory clause to the title Confirmation." (Annals of Evangelical Nonconformity, by T. W. Davids, p. 130.)

[1] See Editor's Preface to vol. v. of Cosin's Works in the Anglo-Catholic Library, p. xviii. It came probably from the Middleburgh press. See Procter on Common Prayer, p. 115, note 1.

[2] See Appendix, Note B.

[3] We are told that on this occasion "the Presbyterians heaped together all the old exceptions which the Puritans for a hundred years had raised against the Liturgy, with the addition of some new ones." (Preface to Nicholls's Common Prayer, ix.)

then the Puritan Divines pay no particular regard to the Catechism? They sent in six exceptions to it. Is it possible then that they did not have under their eye the part added at the Hampton Court Conference? Three of the answers from this part are set down by them for amendment. But not one of the answers which teach the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is noticed or referred to in any way. How is this to be accounted for?

This is a fact to which I must be allowed to direct very special attention. Let it be permitted to me to say without offence to any, that it is surely a matter worthy of the very calm and serious consideration of all, who, from whatever point of view, have been in the habit of regarding this answer as having something of a "Real Objective" look—as not sounding quite like the pure language of the Reformed; that at the Savoy there was actually nothing hinted concerning any amendment, of which, in the view of the Puritans, this answer might be capable.

At a time when the Dissentients were called upon by their principles, and prompted by their feelings, and required by a great occasion, to point out all the blemishes they could, and multiply objections to the uttermost, and find fault wherever fault could be found—no objection was made to this answer, and no fault was found with the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper.

Here the Puritans did not ask for one word to be altered, did not desire one phrase to be amended.

This answer in the Catechism has passed their scrutiny unchallenged. It has stood the fire of their severest criticism, and has come out without a hair singed. *The keen piercing eye of the most searching Puritan inspection has been upon it, and we have it on record, that there* WAS FOUND IN IT NOT A FLAW.

And how, I ask, is this to be accounted for?

It is utterly unaccountable, I believe, on the supposition of this answer speaking the language or containing the doctrine of those who held the Eucharistic opinions of Luther. And how, I ask, is all this to be accounted for? It can only be accounted for in one way, and that is, by the fact that this addition to the Catechism was neither intended nor understood to teach any such doctrine. And thus we are led to our third point, which is:—

III. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject

but what is the language common to all the Reformed Protestants of that day.

By "that day" I mean to include a whole century, indeed more than fifty years before that date, and more than full fifty years after. I mean it to go back to take in the Reformation period of King Edward's reign, and to go forward to the date of the Conference of Savoy, and final settlement of our formularies.[1]

[1] The historical argument might be materially added to. Dean Goode has brought together valuable extracts from a *catena* of expositions of the Catechism, commencing with that of Dr. Mayer, which was published about the year 1622, the later editions of which (at least) were "published by command," with the royal arms affixed; and ending with that of Bishop Mann, published in the latter part of the last century. They may be consulted in Goode's work on the Eucharist, vol. ii., pp. 697-727. They may be said, I think, all (though not all with equal distinctness) in their teaching to exclude "The Real Objective Presence."

Some considerable historical weight must also be attributed to the following very positive statement as to the meaning of the Church of England in this very answer of the Catechism, made by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who, it will be observed, speaks of the doctrine taught as being the doctrine also "generally of the Protestants."

"The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants in this article, is, that after the minister of the holy mysteries hath ritely prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual, real manner; so that all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His passion: the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the blood of the covenant by using it as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this:—it is bread, and it is Christ's body: it is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they can, Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can, and to the same real purposes to which they are designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul as the elements do the body. It is here as in the other sacrament; for as there natural water becomes the laver of regeneration, so here bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ; but there and here too the first substance is changed by grace, but remains the same in nature. That this is the doctrine of the Church of England is apparent in the Church Catechism, affirming the 'inward part or thing signified' by the consecrated bread and wine to be 'the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper;' and the 'benefit' of it to be—'the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine:' and the same is repeated severally in the exhortation, and in the prayer of the address before the consecration, in the canon of our communion; 'verily and indeed' is *reipsa*, that's really enough, That's our sense of the 'real presence;' and Calvin affirms as much, saying, 'In the supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given under the signs of bread and wine.' And Gregory de Valentia gives this account of the doctrine of the Protestants,—that although Christ be corporally in heaven, yet is He received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind, through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the bodily mouth, etc. And which is the greatest testimony of all, we, who best know our own minds, declare it to be so." (Works, vol. vi., pp. 13, 14.)

And of this period, I think, it may be confidently asserted, and satisfactorily shewn, that there is nothing whatever taught in the Catechism, which may not be matched (1) in the writings of our English Reformers, (2) in the Confessions of faith of other Reformed Churches, (3) in the declarations of Puritan Divines.

(1) To take first the case of our English Reformers. Mr. Sedley Taylor has made such a careful and well-chosen selection of a few brief passages from their writings, that (though very many more might be added) I cannot do better than quote from his pamphlet, what I may call the cream of his extracts, asking my readers to bear carefully in mind that the writers have all borne witness to their repudiation of the Real Objective Presence.

(1) "Take then this lesson . . . that thou look up with faith upon the *holy body and blood* . . . thou *receive* it . . . and thou *take* it fully." (Homily on worthy receiving of the Sacrament, Part I.—quoting from Emissenus.)

(2) "He (Christ) . . . feedeth . . . with His own flesh . . . and giveth . . . drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." (Cranmer[1] on Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., p. 7.)

(3) "He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst." (Ibid. p. 34.)

(4) "As the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's Supper, so is the very *body* of Christ inwardly eaten *indeed* of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do." (Ibid. p. 35.)

(5) Christ "is spiritually *eaten* . . . and yet this is '*really*,' that is to say in deed and effectually." (Ibid. p. 71.)

(6) "I believe that . . . we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood."[2] (Hooper, ii., pp. 48, 49.)

[1] "The Catechism says nothing that Cranmer, who denies the Real Presence, did not say; in fact, Cranmer and the Catechism speak alike." ("Dublin Review," Jan., 1869, p. 245.)

[2] Among our Reformers, one of the most determined and pronounced opponents of the Corporal Presence, was Bishop Hooper, who counted the Lutheran doctrine "more erroneous" than that of the Papist. (See Orig. Letters, P. S. Edit., i., pp. 37-38.) But the "*verily and indeed*" of our Catechism, are the very words of Hooper, and are applied by him to the very same "*receiving*," as in the Catechism, and to the receiving of the *very same* THING. Hooper says, "I believe and confess, . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do *verily and indeed receive* HIS BODY AND BLOOD." (Later Writings; P. S. Edit., p. 49.)

What particular is there in the answer of the Catechism which is not completely

(7) "The faithful may otherwise eat Christ's body, and that *verily and indeed*, and not only in the Sacrament." (Jewel, Sermon and Harding, p. 450.)

Taking these together, Mr. Taylor excellently observes, "We find the following expressions:

take . . . receive . . . body and blood. (1)
very body . . . eaten indeed. (4)
eat . . . Christ's body . . . verily and indeed. (7)
verily and indeed receive His body and blood. (6)

Compare these with the paragraph of the Catechism, 'The Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed taken and received* in the Lord's Supper,' and it will be seen that every single expression used in it is to be found in the passages just examined." [1]

(2) In the Confessions of Faith of other Reformed Churches it may not be possible (as it could hardly be expected) to find such an actual identity of expressions; but it will not be difficult to find, at least a real and true identity of teaching.[2]

covered by these words of one by whom "the Real Objective Presence" would certainly have been classed among "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits"?

Mr. Medd says, that the opposition to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., "was led by the extremer school of Reformers, headed by the impracticable Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester." (Introduction to First Book of Edward, p. xii.)

How can it be maintained that a formulary which, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, teaches the very teaching, and speaks in the very words of Hooper, can only be fairly understood in the "Real Objective" sense?

Dr. Pusey says, "'Verily and in deed;' in deed and in truth; really and truly, are 'the body and blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper by the faithful,' and so by each one of us, if we are faithful. 'If this be not the Real Presence' I heard in my youth from an old clergyman, 'I know not how it could be expressed.'" ("Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 166.) No doubt it is the Real Presence, in some sense. But it must be obvious, I think, that no argument can be drawn from this language in support of "The Real Presence" which Dr. Pusey teaches, unless first, Dr. Pusey will accept and be satisfied with such a "Real Presence" as was taught by Bishop Hooper.

Language rising to the same level is found repeatedly in the writings of Jewel, who, in opposition to the doctrine of a Real Corporal Presence at least, was scarcely less thorough-going than Hooper; and who, though pronounced by Hooker to be "the worthiest divine in Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years" (Eccles. Pol., ii., chap. v., § 4), has, in late years, been stigmatized as "an irreverent dissenter." (See Essays on the Church, p. 160.) Take as an example the following:—

"We teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's *body and blood indeed and verily is* GIVEN *unto us;* that we *verily eat* it; that we *verily drink* it; that we *verily* be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of His bones, and flesh of His flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Him." (Jewel, Sermon and Harding, p. 448.)

[1] See pp. 6, 8, of "The so-called Real Objective Presence in the Lord's Supper no doctrine of the Church of England, by Sedley Taylor, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge." (Macmillan & Co.)

[2] See "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 741.

(*a*) We will turn first to the latter Confession of Helvetia 1566 —written by the pastors of Zurich (Bullinger being the most prominent) "and approved and subscribed not only by the Tigurines (inhabitants of Zurich) themselves, and their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangalia, Rhetia, Mulhausen and Bienne; but by the Churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary, and of Scotland."[1]

This is that Confession of which we have seen Grindal writing to Bullinger that we most fully agree with it.[2] Nothing can well be clearer than its repudiation of anything like the Real Objective Presence and the doctrine of the Lutherans on the Lord's Supper, of which evidence may be seen above in our third Paper, p. 106, note. The following extracts are made from the English translation as given in Mr. Hall's "Harmony of Protestant Confessions."

"The Lord by this sacred rite . . . doth now *feed* us with His *flesh*, and giveth us His *blood* to drink. . . . By this holy Supper . . . *the faithful* . . . *receive* . . . the flesh and blood of the Lord, and do feed on them to life everlasting." (Pages 316-7.)

"By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the *very body* of our Lord Jesus, *given* for us; which . . . is *received* of the faithful . . . by faith." (Page 318.)

(*b*) Secondly,[3] we will turn to the former Confession of Helvetia.

It was "written at Basle, about the year 1536, in behalf of all the churches of Helvetia, and sent and presented to the assembly of divines at Wirtemburg," by Bucer and Capito.

The following passages are quoted, as before, from Hall's Harmony.

"We do indeed eat the body, and we do indeed drink the blood, of our Lord." (Page 322.)

"These holy gifts of God are represented unto us by visible signs, to wit, bread and wine . . . here we must think upon greater things, to wit, not of eating bread, or drinking wine, but

[1] See Hall's "Harmony of Protestant Confessions," (xxxix.).

[2] Of this Confession also, Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, writes to Bullinger (1574), "That Confession of true religion which you published in 1566, is now read in English, and in the hands of every one." (Zurich Letters, i., p. 304.)

This Confession was declared by the Bishop of Meaux to excel "all other compendiums of the same kind which he had seen in precision and plainness." (See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 3.)

[3] See Hall's "Harmony," xxxviii.

of *receiving* the Lord Himself, with all His gifts, by a faithful mind." (Page 322.)

"It is most evident, that in the Holy Supper we do not take away our Lord Christ from His church, nor deny *that His body and blood is there received* to be our nourishment unto life eternal." (Page 323.)

(*c*) The Confession of Basle[1] was first written in German, about 1532. But in 1561 it was again recognised and received by the ministers of Basle. It is sometimes called the Confession of Mulhausen. The following brief extract is to our purpose:—

"In the Supper of the Lord . . . we firmly believe . . . that our souls, by faith in Christ crucified, are fed and moistened with the flesh and blood of Christ." (Page 325.)

(*d*) The Confession of France[2] was first presented to Francis the Second, in 1559; again in 1561, to Charles the Ninth; and in 1566 was published in Latin, by the Pastors of the French churches, with a preface to all other evangelical pastors.

In this Confession we have under Article 36, the following statement:—

"We affirm that the Holy Supper of the Lord . . . is a witness to us of our uniting with our Lord Jesus Christ; because that He . . . *doth indeed feed us* and nourish us *with His flesh and blood*. . . . We believe that . . . He doth nourish and quicken us *with the substance* of His body and blood, *apprehended by faith*." (Hall's "Harmony," p. 330.)

And again, under Article 37, "We believe . . . that God doth *indeed*, that is truly and effectually, give whatsoever He doth there sacramentally represent: and accordingly with the signs we join the true *possession* and *fruition* of *that* thing, which is there offered unto us. Therefore we affirm, that they which do bring pure faith, as it were a certain vessel, unto the Holy Supper of the Lord, do *indeed receive that* which there the signs do witness; namely that the *body and blood of Jesus Christ* are no less *the meat and drink of the* soul, than bread and wine are the meat of the body." (Hall's "Harmony," p. 331.)

(*e*) Next we take from the Confession of Scotland, composed by Knox (allowed by Parliament, 1560, ratified 1567, and subscribed by the King, 1581),[3] the following passage, "As the

[1] See Hall's "Harmony," p. xxxviii. [2] *Ibid.* p. xxxix.
[3] See Hall's "Harmony," p. xxxix., and Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 3.

Eternal Godhead giveth to the flesh of Christ Jesus . . . life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus *His flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us*, give unto us the same prerogatives." (Hall's "Harmony," p. 335.)

(*f*) Lastly, we appeal to the Belgian[1] Confession, published in the name of all churches of Belgia, 1566, and confirmed in public Synod, 1579.[2] Here it is declared, "He testifieth, that as *truly* as we do *receive* and *hold in our hands* this sign, eating the same with our mouths . . . so *truly* we *do by faith* (which is to our soul instead of hand and mouth) *receive* the *very body* and *true blood* of Christ. . . . Neither shall we err in saying, that that which is eaten is the very natural body of Christ, and that that which is drunk is the very blood of Christ. . . . Christ is *communicated* to the *faithful* ONLY." (Hall's "Harmony," pp. 336, 337.)

With these may be compared the following from the Irish Articles of 1615: "In the outward part of the Holy Communion, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented, being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals; that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part, the *same body and blood* is REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY *presented unto all* those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His name." (See Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 517.)

It seems needless to stay to point out the agreement of these Confessions (drawn up by those who entirely repudiated the Corporal Presence) with the answer in the Catechism.

There is nothing which can be drawn out from the teaching of the Catechism, or fairly fastened on to its expressions, which is not clearly taught in these Confessions of faith.[3]

[1] At the Synod of Dort, "The English Divines" agreed to this Confession, "except the Articles relating to the parity of ministers and ecclesiastical Discipline." (See Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., p. 466.) In this Confession it is declared that, "Although the signs be coupled with the things signified, yet both of them are not received of all. For an evil man verily receiveth the Sacrament unto his own condemnation; but the thing or truth of the Sacrament he *receiveth not.* . . . For Christ is communicated to *the faithful* ONLY." (See Fuller's "Church History," vol. iii., p. 280. Edit. 1837.)

[2] See Hall's "Harmony," p. xxxix.

[3] Other Protestant testimonies of the same character may be seen in Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation," chap. ii. The following also may be added:

"We affirm that no distance of place can hinder the communion which we have with Christ's body and blood; because the Supper of the Lord is a heavenly thing, and though upon earth we receive with our mouths bread and wine, *viz.*, the true

They all unite in bearing witness to the truth, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

(3) It remains to make good our assertion concerning the agreement also in this teaching of our English Puritans.[1]

symbols of His body and blood; yet by faith, and through the operation of the Holy Spirit, our souls (of which this is the chief food) being carried up into heaven, enjoy the body and blood present. And in this respect, we say that the body does truly join itself to the bread, and the blood to the wine, but yet no otherwise than sacramentally, neither after a local or natural manner. But because they do effectually signify that *God gives them* to the faithful communicants, and that they do *by faith* TRULY AND CERTAINLY *receive* them." (Resolution of Protestants at the Colloquy of Poissy. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 61.)

Of the Zwinglians, at the Conference of Marburg, it is said: "Neque negari volunt, verum corpus et sanguinem Christi adesse." (Seckend., 138. See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 7.)

[1] Is there anything in the teaching of the answer of the Catechism which is not contained in the following words of John Owen?

"Christ is REALLY *exhibited and communicated* to the souls of men who exercise faith upon Him in this ordinance—REALLY *exhibited*, with all the benefits of His death. . . . That there is such an exhibition of Christ, appears—(1) By the sacramental relation there is between the outward elements and the thing signified. 'This is my body,' says Christ—'this bread is so;' and, 'this is my blood.' *It is the* BODY OF CHRIST *and* THE BLOOD OF CHRIST that we are invited to *the* PARTICIPATION OF. If there was no more in this ordinance exhibited but only the outward elements, and not, by virtue of sacramental relation upon God's institution, *the body and blood of Christ*, His life, and death, and merits, exhibited unto us, we should come to the Lord's table like men in a dream, eating and drinking, and be quite empty when we have done; for this bread and wine will not satisfy our souls. (2) As it is plain, from the sign and the thing signified, that there is a *grant or a* REAL COMMUNICATION of Jesus Christ unto the souls of them that do believe; so it is evident from the nature of the exercise of faith in this ordinance. It is by *eating and drinking*. CAN YOU EAT AND DRINK, *unless something be* REALLY COMMUNICATED? *You are called to* EAT THE FLESH *and* DRINK THE BLOOD OF THE SON OF MAN; *unless* REALLY *communicated, we cannot eat it nor drink it*. We may have other apprehensions of these things, but *our faith* cannot be *exercised in* EATING AND DRINKING; *which is a* RECEIVING of *what is* REALLY *exhibited and communicated*. As *truly*, my brethren, as we do eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, which is really communicated to us; so *every true* BELIEVER doth RECEIVE *Christ*, HIS BODY AND BLOOD, *in all the benefits* of it, that are REALLY *exhibited* by God unto the soul in this ordinance: and it is a *means of communicating to* FAITH." (Works, Edit. Gould, vol. ix., p. 617.)

Again, "This bread doth not contain the body of Christ, or the flesh of Christ; the cup doth not contain the blood of Christ: but they exhibit them: both do *as* REALLY *exhibit* them to believers as they partake of the outward signs. Certainly we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ doth not invite us unto this table for the bread that perishes, for outward food: it is to feed our souls. What do we think then? doth He invite unto an *empty painted feast?* do we deal so with our friends? Here is something REALLY *exhibited* by Jesus Christ unto us *to* RECEIVE, besides the outward pledges of bread and wine. We must not think the Lord Jesus Christ deludes our souls with *empty shows and appearances*. That which is exhibited is Himself; it is 'HIS FLESH as *meat indeed*, and HIS BLOOD *as drink indeed*;' it is Himself *as broken and crucified* that He exhibits unto us. And it is the fault and sin of every one of us, if we do not receive Him." (Ibid. p. 573.)

For this purpose we cannot do better than appeal to "The humble advice of the Assembly of Divines by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Confession of Faith . . . presented by them . . . to both Houses of Parliament."

This contains (1) The Westminster Confession of Faith, and (2) The larger, and (3) The shorter Catechism. I quote from an edition of 1658.

"Worthy Receivers outwardly partaking of the visible elements, in this sacrament, do then also inwardly *by faith*, REALLY and INDEED[1] . . . *receive* and *feed upon Christ Crucified*, and all the benefits of His death: The *body and blood of Christ being* then . . . as really . . . present to the Faith of Believers in that ordinance, as elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Confession, chap. xxix., 7, pp. 99, 100.)[2]

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

"A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein . . . they that worthily communicate, *feed upon His body and blood.* . . ." (Larger Catechism, p. 131.)

"The body and blood of Christ . . . are . . . *present* to the faith of the receiver, NO LESS TRULY AND REALLY than the elements themselves are to their outward senses; so they that worthily communicate in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein *feed* upon the body and blood of Christ . . . TRULY

Again he says, "The sacrifice is offered; Christ is the sacrifice—God's passover; God makes a feast upon it, and invites His friends to sit down at His table." (p. 566.)

The following is from Flavel:—

"*Christian.* If the bread and wine be not the body and blood of Christ, really and substantially, how then doth the true believer, in receiving, eating, and drinking them, *receive, eat, and drink the body and blood of Christ?*

"*Minister.* By receiving those elements so consecrated, as signs, seals, and conveyances of Christ and His benefits to the soul; and a true Christian *hath them conveyed to him thereby*, AS REALLY *as* a writing under hand, seal, and witnesses, can convey lands, or other benefits, which are not really in the writings themselves." (Flavel's Works, Edit. 1716, vol. ii., p. 695.)

Let the two be carefully compared, and it will be found, I think, that there is no teaching in the Catechism which there is not in the teaching of Flavel, unless it can be maintained that the words, "*taken and received*," mean more than the words "*received, eaten and drunk*," or that the words, "verily and indeed," add something material to the sense of the word "really."

[1] Important qualifying words are omitted for the purpose of bringing out more clearly the points of resemblance.

[2] In the Prayer Book composed by Baxter and presented to the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, the minister is directed at the close to address the communicants thus: "Dear brethren, we have been here feasted with the Son of God at His table, upon His flesh and blood," etc. (See Hall's Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, vol. iv., p. 77.) And so in the Exhortation at the commencement it is said: "The feast is prepared for you . . . a feast of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 60.)

AND REALLY, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ Crucified, and all the benefits of His death." (Larger Catechism, p. 132.)

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

"A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving Bread and Wine according to Christ's appointment, His death is shewed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by *faith*, made PARTAKERS OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, with all His benefits to their spiritual nourishment, and growth in grace." (Shorter Catechism, pp. 35, 36.)

None, I imagine, will maintain that the Assembly of Divines taught, or meant to teach, the Real Objective Presence; yet to judge from their actual words, it seems to me, that they taught and meant to teach it neither more nor less, but, just as much as the Church of England taught or meant to teach it in the words so often, for that purpose, quoted from her Catechism.

But then shall we come to the conclusion, that all Divines, English and Foreign, Conformist and Puritan,[1] had conspired

[1] I subjoin some further extracts from Puritan divines, which will be found, more or less, completely to justify and confirm the teaching of the Catechism :—

"It is the Lord's table, and what feasted and cheered the heart of God in heaven, viz. *the body and blood of Christ*, God *gives us* to feast our souls on earth, so that we do in a manner eat and drink with Him in the love banquet. Take, eat, manifests a communion. Christ is *really presented to us, and faith really takes Him* . . . as if we did *really eat His flesh and drink His blood* presented to us in the elements. . . . *We eat that body and drink that blood*, which atoned God, and thereby have a communion with Him in His pleasure and delight." (Charnock's Works; Nicholl's Edit., vol. iv., p. 408.)

"There is a conveyance: *Take*, eat; *Take*, drink; *Take* Christ with all His treasures." (Ibid. p. 406.)

"What bread and wine do physically convey to the body, which is strength, comfort, nourishment, that doth the body and blood of Christ by faith convey to the soul." (Ibid. p. 409.)

"This precious blood, which was the costly price of man's redemption . . . is *drunk*, *received*, signified, and sealed in the supper." (Swinnock's Works; Edit. Nicholls, vol. i., p. 173.) "When thou puttest forth the hand of thy body to take the bread and wine, do thou put forth the hand of faith to *receive* the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 205.)

"He hath in a stupendous way appointed *His own body and blood* to be *received and shared* as a feast among us, succeeding that sacrifice once offered up. 1 Cor. x. 16: 'The bread we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? the cup, the communion of His blood?' (So speaks Paul, a most faithful interpreter of these mysteries)." (Goodwin's Works; Nicholls's Edit., vol. ii., p. 385.)

"Now it [the bread] may be called His body, because His blessing hath infused that virtue into it, that it doth not only represent His body, but *convey* His body and Himself unto us. . . . When we see the minister give the bread to our hand, we must conceive that Christ *as truly* offereth Himself to our faith to be *received of us*. . . . The eating of the bread and drinking of the wine doth signify that His

together at that time, to use language unsuitable to the subject, language which we do right now to pronounce mistaken and misleading?

I trust we may not come to any such conclusion, and therefore I desire to show:

IV. That this language is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

If it be not the proper language on the subject, wherein is its impropriety?

(1) Is it that this language teaches of a participation of Christ's body and blood?

And is it a part then (I speak as in the name of the Reformed) —is it, I ask, a part of our faith to believe, that when St. Paul has taught us that the bread broken and the cup blessed is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, there is in the Lord's Supper no communion and no participation of that body and blood?

Is a part of our opinion, that whereas, our Lord Himself has taught that without participation of His flesh and blood we can have no true life in our souls—we should renounce all participation of that flesh and blood in the very sacrament consecrated by His Word, saying, "This is my body, This is my blood"—and leave such participation to be, not the exclusive *claim* only, but the exclusive possession of those, whom we regard as being in error in this matter?

Is this, I ask, a part of our faith? And I am sure I may take an answer from all true sons and daughters of the Reformed Church of England—"GOD FORBID!"

(2) Is the impropriety then in the teaching of the *reality* and *verity* of this participation?

But our Reformers taught that[1] *our* participation, the parti-

flesh and blood do nourish in us life eternal, as the bread and wine do nourish the life present." (H. Smith, in Works, Nicholls's Edit., vol. i., pp. 46, 47, 44.)

"Let us consider his [St. Paul's] earnest assertion. . . . *The cup of blessing;* etc. . . . That is to say, Have not we that truly believe in our Saviour Christ, and who do by a true faith eat the bread and drink the wine of the Sacrament: have we not, I say, our very true communion with the body and blood, though in a spiritual manner; yea, with the whole human nature; yea, and thereby even with whole Christ, both God and man?" (Robert Allen's "Doctrine of the Gospel," Edit. 1606, bk. iii., p. 56.)

[1] "It is great folly to say, 'verily' and 'fleshly' are all one thing. Indeed, the spiritual eating of Christ's body by faith is *the* TRUE *eating;* and he that eateth the same *most spiritually* eateth *most truly*." (Jewel, Sermon and Harding, p. 468.)

"This spiritual receipt, which is by faith, is so effectual, etc. . . . God's Holy Word knoweth *no other* receipt of Christ's very body and natural flesh, neither in the Sacrament, nor without it." (Hutchinson's Works, p. 263.)

cipation of our souls *by faith,* is the real and true, the *only* true and real participation of Christ's body and blood. And what participation is that which we would have without its verity and reality?

And what did our Lord mean, when teaching of the necessity of that participation, He added that solemn emphasis in those words which He said before, "Verily, Verily," "Amen, Amen"? Listen again to His saying:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." There is a terrible reality and verity in the soul's great need, in the soul's great hunger. There is a "verily" in the telling, by Him who is the Truth, of the necessity of our being partakers of His Body, given for the life of the world. And shall there be no verity, no truth and reality, no "verily and indeed" in the making good of His Word, who saith, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed"? Shall we be taught, "verily and indeed" to know our great want, the absolute necessity of our being made partakers of the crucified body and blood of Christ; and then be offended at being taught to know that the body and blood of Christ are "*verily and indeed*" taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper?[1] Let every Christian heart answer again—"God Forbid."

(3) Is the impropriety then in the expressing of this true participation by the words, "taken and received"? But is it not right that faith should be taught to know and exercise her true office of taking, and receiving, and feeding on the gift of God? To think that this taking and receiving, viewed in connexion with the words of the Article, "given, taken, and received," speak of a giving by the hand of the priest,[2] and a

[1] "That we verily and undoubtedly receive Christ's body in the Sacrament, is neither denied nor in question. . . . The thing that is inwardly received in faith and in spirit, is received *verily and indeed.*" (Jewel's Works. Sermon and Harding, p. 475.)

[2] It is not (of course) denied that in an inferior sense the minister *may be said to give* the *res sacramenti*, inasmuch as ministerially he delivers the signs and seals by which they are exhibited. In this sense Swinnock the Puritan says: "So doth the Church by this sacrament bestow on all her children, through Christ, that food which is needful for health and strength." (Works, Nicholls's Edit., vol. i., p. 182.) "Might we not," asks the Bishop of Llandaff, "be said to give an estate by placing in the hands of another the title-deeds and conveyance of the property?" (Charge, 1869, p. 144.)

Brooks the Puritan said: "With Chrysostom, I had rather give my life to a murderer, than Christ's body to an unworthy receiver; and had rather to suffer my own blood to be poured out like water, than to tender Christ's blessed blood to any base liver." (See Appendix to Memoir in Brooks's Works, vol. i., pp. 49, 50, of Nicholls's Edition.)

taking and receiving with the hand and the mouth of our body, is utterly to mistake the meaning of the words, and to fasten on them a sense which they cannot fairly bear. To know something of the language of our Reformers, is to know that such a sense they would not have dreamt of. To view this language through the teaching of the Reformation, is to see that our Reformers would never have accepted such an interpretation. The language of the Catechism is in perfect harmony with their language.[1] They spoke and taught, as the Catechism speaks and teaches, of taking and receiving. But their taking and receiving belong to the actions, and the working, not of the body, but of the soul. In their view of the Lord's Supper, not the elements only, but the whole circumstances of the ordinance bear a certain sacramental and spiritual signification. Something in the same way as in baptism, not "the outward visible sign" only, but the "form" of going down to the washing and rising again from the water,[2] have their spiritual counterpart, not only in the washing of the soul in Christ's blood, but also in the soul's going down to be buried with Christ and to rise again with Him—Baptism, representing to us our profession, that as Christ died and rose, so should we also, being buried with Christ by baptism into death, reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord—something in the same way, the matter stands with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in the view of our Reformers and their successors. They see in it, not only the reality represented by the visible element; not only the reality for the soul in the body and blood of Christ, by which the soul is to be strengthened and refreshed, as the body by the bread and wine; and not only in the breaking of the bread, and pouring out of the wine, do they see a sacramental action, with a sacramental signification, even a showing forth of the

[1] The following is from Dean Goode:—

"If we take the words *body and blood* of Christ in their *proper sense*, then the statement that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received, can be understood but in one way, that is, that they are so taken and received by the soul in a spiritual manner. And this is the manner in which our Church tells us, in her 28th Article, that they are received. And the divines of the sixteenth century, who held this view, were *very careful* to express themselves in the *strongest terms* as to the *reality* of this *reception*, and to point out that it was *quite as true* and *real* a reception, and *far more* so, for all *spiritual purposes*, than a reception by the mouth could be. And it is only from the too prevalent *want of knowledge of the phraseology in use at that period*, that these words of our Catechism have ever created a difficulty or suggested a doubt as to the doctrine of our Church on the subject." ("Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 690.)

[2] See Waterland, vol. iv., p. 577, sqq.

Lord's death; but they regard the body and blood of Christ as *given* to the soul's faith, even as the bread and wine are *given* to the body;—*given* to the soul by a present Saviour, a Saviour seen by the eye of faith; even as the bread and wine are given to the body by a present minister, a minister seen by the eye of the body;[1] and they regard the believer's soul as doing by faith just what the body does when it takes the elements in its hand; they see in the soul the hand of faith stretched out to take, and the mouth of faith ready to receive; even as the mouth of the body receives the visible element, even so faith, the soul's mouth, receiving verily and indeed that which is signified and sealed by the bread and wine outwardly received according to Christ's institution. Yes, the soul thus receiving verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, that the believer may feed on Him in his heart by faith with thanksgiving.

This giving, taking, and receiving is all inward and spiritual, though having their exact counterpart in actions outward and visible.[2]

This giving, taking, and receiving pertains entirely to the soul. It is only and entirely "after a heavenly and spiritual manner." It is in every part and particular belonging to the invisible. It is a giving to the soul, and a receiving by the soul. And this none the less, because it is pictured and represented by, and not only so, but bound up by Christ's institution

[1] See Appendix, Note C.

[2] "As with our corporal eyes, corporal hands, and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread, and drink the wine (being the *sign* and *Sacraments* of Christ's body;) even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste, and eat His very flesh, and drink His very blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 226.)

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says:—"Christians are spiritual men; faith is their mouth, and wisdom is their food, and believing is manducation, and Christ is their life." (Vol. viii., p. 24.)

So Bishop Hall says:—"My bodily eye doth not more truly see bread and wine, than the eye of my faith sees the body and blood of my dear Redeemer; . . . my hand does not more sensibly take, nor my mouth more really eat this bread, than my soul doth spiritually receive and feed on the bread of life." (Bishop Hall, Works, vol. vii., p. 512; Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

So Calvin:—"Sacram illam carnis et sanguinis sui communicationem, quæ vitam suam in nos transfundit, Christus, non secus ac si in ossa et medullas penetraret, in Cœna etiam testatur, et obsignat. . . . Si verum est præberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandum invisibilis rei donationem: accepto corporis symbolo, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis dari certo confidamus." (Institutes, lib. iv., ch. xvii., § 10, Fo. 489; Edit. 1618, Geneva.)

"Summa sit, non aliter animas nostras carne et sanguine Christi pasci, quam panis et vinum corporalem vitam tuentur et sustinent. Neque enim aliter quadraret analogia signi, nisi alimentum suum animæ in Christo reperirent: quod fieri non potest nisi nobiscum Christus verè in unum coalescat, nosque reficiat carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potu." (Ibid. Fo. 489, *a.*)

and blessing, with the visible taking and receiving of that visible thing, which signifies and seals the invisible gift to the soul.[1]

In this giving, taking and receiving, the Giver is no priest that stands before any altar on earth. It is God Himself, not a mortal man, Who, in our duly receiving these holy mysteries or signs, vouchsafes to feed us with the true spiritual food of our soul. The Giver may indeed be said to be the One Eternal Priest. It is He whom faith only sees, but whom faith sees indeed, as a present, personal Saviour. And the taking is the work of no outstretched hand of the body, and the receiving is the opening of no bodily lips. No! but the taking is not less real, when the soul which is labouring, not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto eternal life, and which he knows the Son of man will give; when the soul which knows its need of a Saviour, knows its need of being made partaker of the sacrifice of His death—draws near, not merely with a bodily approach to the Lord's table, but draws near with faith to the very Lord of the table, whose voice is heard speaking those comfortable words to its great need, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest;" and draws near to receive, with the full assurance of faith—to receive, not from the bread and wine, not from the minister,[2] but with bread and wine, and with the receipt of that food[3] for the body from the minister's hand,[4] to receive from Christ Himself all that is needed to make good to the soul the full and blessed meaning of His own words:—"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

[1] See Appendix, Note D.

[2] Mr. Cobb appears to me to be mistaken when he represents the Church as saying to her children, on what he would call the subjective theory, "You do verily and *indeed* receive the elements, and you do verily and *indeed* receive Christ, but there is no *correspondence* between the two receptions." (Sequel, p. 290.) On the contrary, it appears to me that the correspondence is very close and intimate.

Beza says:—"Signa . . . miram convenientiam et analogiam habent cum iis rebus quarum vivæ sunt imaginès, propter characterem illis ex Dei verbo impressum." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 27. See Jewel, Harding and Thess., p. 780; Bullinger's Decades, vol. iv., pp. 329, 330; Calvin's Institutes, lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 3 and 10; Brevint's Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, pp. 14, 15.)

[3] "Non dubium est quin Deus, qui summè fidelis est, præter signa visibilia, *rem ipsam* quoque, id est, Jesum Christum unà cum omnibus ipsius opibus, verè et absque ullo dolo fruendum semper offerat, quâ ratione dici potest ac debet (Dei videlicet promittentis respectu) res ipsa cum signis semper verè esse conjuncta." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., pp. 27, 28.)

[4] See Appendix, Note E.

(4) But it will be said, perhaps, that every other objection being removed, it can hardly be proper language to express the view of those who deny the corporal presence,—to say that what is received is *the body and blood of Christ.*

The objection would seem to take something of this form :—"It might be suitable language for you to say that you receive the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of Christ's body and the shedding of His blood. But in the Catechism you say *not this*, but that you receive verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ themselves."

But Hooker [1] speaks of it as universally confessed to be most true that "the efficacy of His body and blood is *not all* we receive in this Sacrament." And for myself I feel in a manner bound to enter something like a protest against [2] such a use of

[1] See Keble's Edit., vol. ii., p. 355. "He (Calvin) was well aware that to assert only an application of the *merit* or *virtue* of Christ's passion, in the Eucharist, came not fully up to many strong expressions of the ancient *Fathers* relating to our union with the *natural* and now glorified body ; nay, it appeared to fall short of St. Paul's doctrine." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 600.)

When Chedsey argued against Cranmer, "It is not true that you say, there to be not the substance of His body, but the efficacy alone thereof," Cranmer answered, "Thus you gather upon mine answer, as though I did mean of the efficacy, and not of the substance of the body ; but I mean of them both, as well of the efficacy as of the substance." (Foxe's Acts and Monuments ; Edit. Seeley, vol. vi., p. 446.)

Jewel declares—"We say and believe that we receive the body and blood of Christ *truly ;* and not a figure or sign ; but even that body which suffered death on the cross, and that blood which was shed for the forgiveness of sins. . . . We say there is *no other* SUBSTANTIAL *food* of our souls ; and that He is divided among all the faithful ; and that he is void of salvation and the grace of Christ, whosoever is not partaker of His body and blood. This we say, and may not flee from it hereafter." (Jewel, Harding, Thess., etc., p. 1110.)

"Non auferimus è Cœna alimentum vitæ, carnem, et sanguinem Christi, et Christum ipsum. Nam nisi animæ nostræ hoc pabulo fuerint pastæ, nequaquam vitam habituræ sunt." (Præf. Apol. to "Consensus Orthodoxus," Zurich, 1605, under "*Non sumus Sacramentarii.*")

"Quidam nobis perperam adscribant, nos spiritualem manducationem ejusmodi docere, quâ non corpus Christi, sed tantum ejus meritum et efficacia percipiatur : quos nobis injuriam facere, libri et confessiones a nostris editæ satis docent." (Ibid. under "*Manducatio Corporis Christi duplex.*")

Calvin says :—"We must needs unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper." (In Coverdale, Fruitful Lessons, p. 441.)

Again :—"In the Supper Christ giveth unto us the *very substance* of His body and blood, that we may with full right possess Him, and in possessing Him be called into the society of all His good things." (Ibid. p. 441.)

Again :—"The Lord doth in very deed give . . . and . . . we do unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 461.)

Again :—"With one voice therefore we all confess, that when we do, according to the institution of the Lord, receive the sacrament with faith, we are undoubtedly made partakers of the *substance* of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid. p. 465.)

[2] If any shelter be needed for such a saying, let me be allowed to shelter myself under the following weighty words of Dean Goode :—

"And while the use of such phraseology, as for instance in our Catechism, has

language as would seem to surrender THE REALITY *of the reception by faith of* THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST *themselves*,[1] because the language which tells of that reality has been perverted by some to a sense we repudiate.

I know, indeed, that the objection which I am dealing with, is one which is felt sometimes as a difficulty by not a few who would desire to take their stand firmly and strongly on the side of the Reformers. They feel afraid of the language which for considerably more than a hundred years, was the language on the subject, I might almost say, of universal Protestantism; and regard it as not sufficiently guarded and accurate.

They shrink from its use because they fear its abuse.

They think the true teaching (the teaching really meant) might be more correctly expressed by such words as, "the Blessings purchased by Christ's Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received."

But such persons may, in all loving-kindness, be asked to consider well, whether the language of the Catechism is not more scriptural. And if more scriptural, must it not, therefore, be more proper language to express *our*[2] views, who take Scripture as our Rule of faith?

exposed us to the charge of Romish doctrine, and tended to mislead uninformed individuals among us, who have not been taught to understand these words in their intended meaning, there has also been an important object in view in their use; and that is, that we should not allow ourselves to be robbed of a phraseology which in its spiritual sense is the *proper phraseology* to *adopt* in the matter, and appear to deny that high and sacred purpose which is to be accomplished in the Lord's Supper, for the sake of preventing that misapprehension of our meaning which arises from a carnal and earthly-minded interpretation of the words. Nay more, this is the phraseology which our blessed Lord himself has used to describe our reception of Him. And therefore in hesitating to adopt it, we should be *making our wisdom rather than His* the standard by which to be guided. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' Justly then does our Catechism say, that 'His body and blood are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' And the only reason why any difficulty is experienced in the interpretation of these words is, that men are apt to run off immediately to the notion of bodily eating, and drinking, because our Lord has graciously instituted a rite in which by visible and bodily acts we are reminded of the spiritual acts expressed in His words; forgetting that all which is seen and done in that rite, *i.e.*, both the things given to and received by the body and the acts of the body, are but outward representations of *that spiritual gift* and that *spiritual act* which are, as it were, the *soul of the ordinance.*" ("Goode on Eucharist," Preface, pp. viii., ix.)

[1] See Appendix, Note F.

[2] Archbishop Secker says that the words in the Catechism are "intended to show that our Church *as truly believes* the strongest ASSERTIONS OF SCRIPTURE concerning this sacrament, as the Church of Rome doth; only takes *more care* to understand them in THE RIGHT MEANING: which is, that though, in one sense, all communicants equally partake of what Christ calls His body and blood, that is, the outward signs of them; yet in a much more important sense, the *Faithful* ONLY,

Is it not wise—is it not right that our formularies should bear witness for us, that "our Church believes" (to use the language of Archbishop Secker) "the strongest assertions of Scripture concerning this Sacrament"?

But, further, I would venture to ask such persons as prefer to speak of receiving the benefits, instead of receiving the *thing* from which the benefits come,—Do you mean to express the receiving of some portion of the benefits cut off and dissociated from THE THING?[1] You will answer, "No," for you know well that what is needed and what is offered is the full and entire possession of *all* the benefits, and that they cannot be really sundered or severed from THE THING. Then allow me to say that you mean by the possession of the benefits—the VERY BENEFICIAL POSSESSION OF THE THING: You mean by receiving the benefit—a receiving of the ACTUAL POSSESSION[2] of THE THING for ALL PURPOSES *for which you can possibly* NEED IT OR USE IT OR ENJOY IT.[3] And that which makes it the

the pious and virtuous Receiver, eats His flesh and drinks His blood." (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., p. 250. Edit. 1769. See "Eccl. History Society's Book of Common Prayer," p. 1473, and "Goode on Eucharist," ii., p. 724.)

[1] Whenever in this section I use the words "THE THING," the reader will, I trust, understand that it is written, and is to be read, with all reverence, as meaning the "Res Sacramenti," the "THING *signified*" sacramentally by the bread which we break, which is the *very true crucified body* of the SON OF GOD.

[2] "If thou doubtest of so great wealth and felicity that is wrought for thee, O man, call to thy mind that, therefore hast thou *received into* THINE OWN POSSESSION the everlasting verity, our Saviour Jesus Christ, *to confirm to thy conscience* the truth of all this matter. Thou hast received Him, if in true faith and repentance of heart thou hast received Him; if in purpose of amendment thou hast received Him for an everlasting gage, or pledge of thy salvation. *Thou hast received* His BODY WHICH WAS ONCE BROKEN, and His blood which was shed for the remission of thy sin. Thou hast received His body, to have within thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for to dwell with thee, to endow thee with grace, to strengthen thee against thine enemies, and to comfort thee with their presence. Thou hast received His body to endow thee with everlasting righteousness, to ensure thee of everlasting bliss, and life of thy soul." (Homily of the Resurrection, p. 389.)

In his earlier writings Luther taught, "Cum sic dicit: Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis traditur: quid quæso aliud dicit, quam hoc? En ego ipse sum, qui pro te trador, hunc thesaurum tibi dono, omnium istorum, quæ habeo, tu quoque sis possessor, si quid tibi deerit, mihi deerit; justitiam meam, beatitudinem meam, et vitam æternam tibi dono." (See Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Part ii., in Works, vol. iv., p. 12. Geneva, 1681.)

"But what then? Do not we in the Sacrament truly partake of the body and blood of Christ? God forbid that any one should deny it. There is none that understands anything of the sacrament but must acknowledge that therein, to all worthy receivers, the body and blood of Christ is both given and likewise received by them. This is the sense of the Church of England, when she doth so often declare that she owns the real presence of Christ's body and blood to all that worthily receive the sacrament." (Archbishop Sharp's Works. Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., pp. 282, 283.)

[3] "This sacrament, duly given and faithfully received, makes the thing which it represents as *really present for* OUR USE, and as really powerful in order to our

most proper language to speak of the receiving and possessing THE THING, is not only, I conceive, that it is most scriptural, but also that hereby are taught two very important truths, and hereby are excluded two pernicious mistakes. (1) The first error thus excluded, is the error of thinking that there may be some limitation to the benefits which the soul may thus be partaker of. For the truth taught here seems to say "Open thy mouth wide and it shall be filled, for here is no mere giving you of any fixed and circumscribed amount of blessing, that you should be able to believe that this much and that much are yours; but here is the giving to you—making over to your faith *the very crucified* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST—that you may be able to say, 'CHRIST DIED FOR ME,' that so, *with that*, you may be able to say, 'All things are mine.'[1] And, therefore, any straitening or limiting the blessing you receive, can never come from any straitening or limiting of that, which, in its power to bless, you receive. It can only come from the straitening of your own soul's apprehension. Therefore, let thy soul open its mouth wide, for it cannot desire, or ask for, or expect, or believe, too much."

(2) And the second error thus excluded, is the error of thinking that there can be any sundering of the *benefits* from[2] THE

salvation, as if the Thing itself were newly done or in doing." (Brevint's "Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," p. 7. Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

[1] This can scarcely be expressed more forcibly than by the Puritan Sibbes. "This bread thus broken is *given*. Here God bringeth his Son bathed in his blood. The Father seeth him in his gore blood, and saith, *Take him*. . . . Besides the offer there is a further *actual delivery of it*. *Take*, eat. They take, eat and drink. What is represented by this? It representeth a further point, that we are not only in Christ, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, but that Christ is *actually delivered*; that we seize ['take possession'] upon him. When we see the bread and wine taken, he meaneth that hereby we by faith do *accept* of Christ, and do *lay hold* of him. Here is the foundation of our comfort, that a Christian may say of Christ, that he can be assured of nothing so much which he possesseth for his own, as he may be of him. His cloak upon his back, his house he dwells in, his lands, yea, the blood in his veins, and whatsoever he hath, is not so much his; he cannot be so assured thereof as of Christ. *Take him*. There is *delivery* and *seizement* of Christ—as by the ring of a door—we are interested into heaven, and if he be ours, with him we have all things," (Works; Nicholls's Edit., vol. iv., pp. 67, 68.)

The same truth is thus clearly expressed by Archbishop Sandys:—"In that he saith 'Take, eat: drink ye all of this,' he evidently declareth that his body and blood are by this sacrament assured to be no less ours than his. . . . He made himself all ours: ours his passions, ours his merits, ours his victory, ours his glory; and therefore he giveth himself and all his, in this sacrament wholly unto us." (Archbishop Sandys's Sermons; P. S. Edit., p. 303.)

[2] "The truth which must be held is this: that we *do* NOT *here receive* ONLY *the benefits* that flow from Christ; but *the* VERY *body and blood of Christ*, that is, Christ himself *crucified*. For as none can be made partaker of the virtue of the bread and

THING, that the *benefits* can come to us any otherwise than from *that* THING—that we ever can receive, or ought to believe that we receive the *benefits*, without being truly made *beneficially partakers of* THE THING—that we may believe that we are justified, without believing in Christ and His atonement—that we may believe that we have received adoption, without believing that *Christ died for us*—believe that we are partakers of *life* without believing that we are partakers of *Christ's death*, believe that we receive what Christ died *to give us* without believing that our faith does indeed beneficially receive, for this very purpose, that very flesh [1] which was crucified for us.

wine to his bodily sustenance, unless he first do receive the substance of those creatures: so neither can any participate in the benefits arising from Christ to his spiritual relief, except he first have communion with Christ himself. We must 'have the Son,' before we 'have life,' and, therefore, '*eat*' him we must. . . . This is that 'eating of the flesh of the Son of man, and drinking of His blood,' which our Saviour insisteth so much upon, in the sixth of John." (Archbishop Ussher's Sermon before Parliament, 1620. Works, vol. ii., pp. 429, 430.)

So Calvin had said,—"Dixi Christum sua nobis bona non communicare, nisi quatenus *ipse noster* est. . . . *Corpus Christi* vere spiritualem esse *cibum*, cujus *substantia* animæ nostræ *pascuntur*, et *vivunt*: idque non minus *vere* in sacra Cœna nobis *præstari*, quam externo symbolo figuratur." ("Secunda Defensio" in Works, vol. viii., p. 667. Amsterdam, 1667.)

[1] "That which quickeneth us is the Spirit of the second Adam, and his FLESH that wherewith he quickeneth. . . . Doth any man doubt but that even from the FLESH of Christ our very bodies do receive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day . . . ? It is of necessity that as well our present sanctification unto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies should presuppose a *participation of the grace, efficacy, merit or virtue of His body and blood*, without which foundation first laid there is no place for those other operations of the Spirit of Christ to ensue." (Hooker, Works, Edit. Keble, vol. ii., pp. 251-253.)

"Vitam spiritualem, quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo duntaxat sitam esse confitemur, quod Spiritu suo nos vivificat, sed quod Spiritus etiam sui virtute CARNIS SUÆ *vivificæ* nos facit *participes*, qua participatione in vitam æternam pascamur." ("Confessio de Eucharistiâ," drawn up by Farel, Calvin and Viret, and signed by Bucer and Capito—quoted from Hardwick's Reformation, pp. 167, 168. Note.)

"Neque censerem recusandam quin huic nostræ formulæ, Christum spiritualiter adesse in Cœnâ, similis quoque interpretatio adjungatur, ne quis nos existimet virtutem Christi ab ipsâ Christi *carne* separare, vel spirituale corpus ei affingere." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 209.)

"The divine nature indeed is the prime fountain of life to all, but, though inexhaustible in itself, yet a fountain whereof we cannot drink, save as it is derived unto us through the human nature of Christ." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. x., p. 36; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

"We are to believe and acknowledge, that as God the Father doth neither forgive nor vouchsafe reconciliation, but for the merits and satisfaction of His only Son; so neither will He vouchsafe to convey this or any other blessing unto us, which His Son has purchased for us, but only through His Son; not only through him as our Advocate and Intercessor, but through him as our Mediator; that is, through his humanity, as the organ or conduit, or as the only bond, by which we are united and reconciled unto the Divine nature. . . . The Spirit of life, whereby our adoption and election is sealed unto us, is the real participation of Christ's body, which was broken, and of Christ's blood, which was shed for us." (Ibid. p. 40.)

Indeed I believe that the force of the objection I am dealing with, would be altogether broken, if it were well considered that there is no such thing as a possibility of our being made partakers of the *benefits* or *efficacy* of *Christ's sacrifice* without being made beneficially partakers of the *very sacrifice itself*. No possibility of receiving the *blessings purchased* by Christ's body and blood without, in some sense, receiving *verily and indeed that very* BODY AND BLOOD.[1]

If our souls are washed and made white, they are washed and made white *only* in the blood of the Lamb. There is no separating the washing from the blood. And in like manner, if our souls are fed, and nourished, and refreshed, by receiving the justification and adoption which come of Christ's atoning death, they must be nourished, and refreshed, and strengthened, by feeding on Christ's *crucified* BODY AND BLOOD. There is no separating the feeding from the sacrifice; no separating the receiving from the body and blood of Christ. Christ and Christ's atoning sacrifice, and Christ's salvation can never be sundered, so that one should be received without the other. Christ's Sacraments may by unbelief, be sundered from all these. Christ's Sacraments may be received without any one of these. But not one of these can be received alone. He that would be *partaker* of the *everlasting life* which Christ gives, must be *partaker* of the *flesh and blood* which CHRIST *gave* and still gives. He that would be partaker of that *flesh and blood*, to feed his soul withal, can be partaker thereof only by coming

[1] Bishop Patrick says that the consecrated elements "do not merely figure to us the breaking of Christ's body, and the shedding of His blood, but are a pledge of that inward and spiritual grace which they represent. What that grace is we are taught in our *Catechism;* when it tells us that it is *the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* That is, they have a *real part and portion* given them in the *death and sufferings* of the Lord Jesus; whose body was broken and blood shed *for remission of sins.* They *truly and indeed partake* of the VIRTUE *of His bloody sacrifice;* whereby He hath obtained an eternal redemption for us. *This is the meaning*, SURE, of *partaking of His body and blood*, which are here communicated. Because this bread and wine do not become His body and blood, by ceasing to be bread and wine; but by tendering them to us as a spiritual grace. Their *efficacy*, therefore, and *virtue*, by the divine avour is made ours. All the *effects* and *benefits* of His passion are imparted to us by these, which in themselves are but God's creatures of bread and wine; yet by His appointment become to us the body and blood of His Son. In short *there is* NOTHING *which the body and blood of Christ* CAN BE TO THE SPIRITS OF MEN, but by these tokens He exhibits it to us, and gives us an INTEREST *in it.* THIS IS SPIRITUALLY TO EAT HIS FLESH, AND DRINK HIS BLOOD, *as both our Church and the ancient speak.* Our souls entertain and feast themselves upon His sacrifice; being really made partakers of whatsoever His body and blood can do for them." (Christian Sacrifice, Part ii., sec. vi., pp. 53, 54. Edit. 1690.)

to HIM, who says, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst."

Our redemption and its blessed fruits; the ransom price and the liberty of the ransomed souls: these things should ever be viewed in their inseparable connexion. CHRIST'S WORK and CHRIST'S GRACE *can never be sundered in fact, and should never be sundered in faith.* THEY CAN NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FACT, *i.e.*, as effect can have no existence except as derived from its sole cause. "We have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins," but we have it and can have it only "through His blood." But for that death and blood-shedding we could not have it. Apart from, *i.e.*, except as coming from, that death and blood-shedding, still we cannot have it. THEY SHOULD NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FAITH, for faith is taught by God's Spirit, who testifies of Christ, and taking of the things of Christ reveals to us Christ's peace; but reveals it only as "made by the *blood* of His cross." And thus faith learns how condemned sinners can only be "reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son."

If I would be justified, I must be justified by faith, and that faith should not only believe *justification*, but believe in HIM, who *died* for my sins and rose again for my *justification*.

If I would *live*, I must live by the faith of the Son of God. If I would live by the faith of the Son of God, it must be by the faith of Him "who loved me and gave Himself for me." And for my faith to believe that He LOVED ME AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR ME, *is* just, *in other words*, to believe that HIS SACRIFICED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE; that I am in *beneficial possession* of them;[1] that they were given for me. And for this faith and this possession, my soul must receive the gift from Him who says, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."[2] This—the *believing indeed that* CHRIST *died and shed His precious blood* FOR ME; this—the very *making Him and His sacrifice my own*, by simply taking them from

[1] See Appendix, Note G.

[2] This use of the true doctrine of the Eucharist is very clearly and beautifully expressed in the Homily:—

"Now it followeth to have with this knowledge a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation with God the Father, but also that He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou acknowledgest no other saviour, redeemer, mediator, advocate, intercessor, but Christ only; and that thou mayest say with the apostle, that He loved thee, and gave Himself for thee. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in His institution, to make Christ thine own, and to apply His merits unto thyself."

Himself the Giver—this is the *taking*, and *receiving*, and *feeding on* the VERY BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.[1]

And our faith is to be taught this; in other words, our faith is to be taught, not only to receive the forgiveness of sins; not only to embrace and hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life; but our faith is to be taught, that if this remission is to be ours, if this life is to be ours; CHRIST *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S SACRIFICE *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S DEATH *must be* OURS. The[2] believer is to be taught to say, "If Christ had not died for me, I must have perished; if Christ did not die for me, I can never have pardon and peace. If I would have pardon and peace, I must know that Christ died for me; I must know that His death and His atonement are mine and for me; I must know that HIS CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE *and* FOR ME; I must have that CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD *made* MINE, that I may know it was FOR ME; *they must be* TRULY GIVEN to me, and I must *receive them*, that I may know that they are MINE; know that they are FOR ME. And when I see how Christ has appointed these seals of all that I require, saying, 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' I see how He has herein met the need of my soul; and in faith receiving these, I know that I receive from Him the very gift they seal and signify to my soul. *Now I know that* CHRIST'S[2] DEATH AND ATONEMENT ARE MINE. I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died *for me*, and so I feed[4] on Him in my heart by faith with thanksgiving."

[1] See Appendix, Note H.

[2] "Sane non video quomodo in cruce Christi, redemptionem ac justitiam, in ejus morte vitam habere se quis confidat, nisi verâ Christi ipsius communione in primis fretus. Non enim ad nos bona illa pervenirent, nisi se prius nostrum Christus faceret. Dico igitur, in cœnæ mysterio per symbola panis et vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeóque corpus et sanguinem ejus, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparandâ nobis justitiâ adimplevit; quo scilicet primùm in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus; deinde participes substantiæ ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus." (Calvin, Instit. lib. iv., cap. xvii., 11.)

So Sibbes the Puritan writes—"We cannot have the benefits of Christ unless we have Christ Himself; and therefore, in the Lord's Supper, Christ saith not, 'This is justification,' or sanctification, but 'This is my body,'" etc. (Works, Nicholl's Edit., vol. iv., p. 68.)

[3] "It hath been observed above, that eating of *idol-meats*, knowingly, was *ipso facto* communicating with idolators, and that communicating with idolators was *ipso facto* partaking of devils, and that the eating of the Jewish sacrifices was *ipso facto* partaking of the altar; therefore also receiving the Holy Communion, fit dispositions always supposed, is *ipso facto* (in that very act, and at that *present* time, *by that act*,) partaking of the *death* of Christ, with the *fruits* or *privileges* of it." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 623. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 34-36.)

[4] "Spiritual feeding, in this case, directly and primarily means no more than the eating and drinking our Lord's body *broken*, and blood *shed*; that is, partaking of

And this truth of the inseparable connection of the gift of our justification with the atonement of Christ; of our life with His death; and of the being made partakers of life, only by being made partakers of His death; and of the receiving of the strengthening and refreshing of our souls *only by receiving the* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST;—as it is taught plainly in our Lord's own words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you"; so is it also (as I think) taught in the words of our Catechism:[1] "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

And let it not be said, "Then for this giving and receiving you must needs make Christ's body and blood to be really *there* in *the elements*."

No. Here is no[2] making the sacrifice of Christ to be *present* on the *altar*. But rather; here, in and through the memorial exhibition of that sacrifice, the faith of the believer is taken to be present as on the very day of the crucifixion, at that One[3] Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, to know that Saviour, that Sacrifice, that atoning death, that blood shedding, all its own—

the *atonement* made by his death and sufferings: this is the prime thing, the ground and basis of all the rest. . . . The foundation of all our spiritual privileges is, our having a part in that *reconcilement*, which, in strictness, is *eating* and *drinking* His flesh and blood in St. John's phrase, and *eating* of the *altar* in St. Paul's." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 541.)

"The spiritual eating of His flesh, and drinking of His blood, by faith, *digesting His* DEATH in our minds, as our only PRICE, RANSOM, and REDEMPTION from eternal damnation, is the cause wherefore Christ said, that if we eat not His flesh, and drink not His blood we have no life in us." (Cranmer, as quoted by Waterland, vol. iv., p. 566.)

[1] Dr. Waterland says, "All that are saved owe their salvation to the salutary passion of Christ, and their *partaking* thereof (which is feeding upon His *flesh* and *blood*) is their life." (Vol. iv., p. 537.)

"The *doctrine* of Christ, lodged in the *soul*, is what gives the soul its proper temperature and fitness to receive the heavenly food; but *the heavenly food* is CHRIST HIMSELF, as ONCE CRUCIFIED, who has since been glorified." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 539.)

[2] "The eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood is not taken in common signification, with mouth and teeth to eat and chaw a thing, being *present*, but by a lively faith in heart and mind to chaw and digest a thing, being *absent*, either ascended hence into heaven, or else not yet born upon earth." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 111.)

"If any do further enquire, how it is possible that any such union should be, seeing the body of Christ is in heaven, and we are upon earth; I answer, that if the manner of this conjunction were carnal and corporal, it would be indeed necessary that the things conjoined should be admitted to be in the same place: but it being altogether spiritual and supernatural, no local presence, no physical nor mathematical continuity or contiguity is any way requisite thereunto." (Archbishop Ussher, Works, vol. ii., p. 431.)

[3] See Appendix, Note I.

and to have it so made over to it, in receiving Christ's own seals of conveyance that it may say, "All this is mine and for me." Can you not really give a large possession locally absent by saying to another of that absent possession, "I have had it fenced off and prepared and tilled on purpose for you; I give it you;—It shall be yours this minute if you will accept it;—Here is the plan representing the estate; Here is my deed of conveyance;—Here are its seals, and signatures"? And can not the other that minute take and receive the possession by saying, "I accept it most thankfully," and taking at once into his hand the seals and effectual tokens of deliverance?[1]

Such a similitude of course fails to represent the full truth of the giving, and taking, and receiving, which we have before us.

Every such picture must of course,[2] fall short of expressing what needs to be expressed, and representing what it should represent.

It fails entirely to express how the receipt of that *absent* gift

[1] "Represent to your mind Jacob dividing among his children every parcel of his estate, and withal surrendering the titles that belong to each division,—'Take thou this, Joseph;—this is the field which my grandfather Abraham bought of Hephron.' . . . It is most certain that the surrendering such instruments (although in themselves but papers or parchments) is in very deed nothing less than giving away the very lands. . . . Here then, Christ our blessed Saviour being desirous before His death, as by a deed of His last will, to settle upon His true disciples such a measure of His grace . . . He delivers into their hands, by way of instrument and conveyance, the blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood (the true root and stem of all blessings), in the same manner, as to His intention, but in a surer way, as to the event and effect, as kings used to bestow dignities by the bestowing of a *staff* or *sword*, and fathers pass as much as they please of their estates on their children, by giving them some few writings. . . . Christ and His estate, His happiness and glory, His eternity and His Heaven, are not things that may be moved more easily than the mountains or the earth: and therefore not to be disposed of in *any other real manner* than great immoveable estates are. . . . The body and blood of Jesus Christ is *in full value*, and Heaven with all its fulness is in *sure title* instated on true Christians by those small portions which they receive at the blessed Communion." (Brevint's "Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," pp. 62, 63, 64; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

"A Sacrament is an annexe unto doctrine, even as a seal is set unto a pardon." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 174; Edit. 1629.)

[2] "HESPUSIUS. Immo subdola est vestra confessio. Intelligitis enim substantiam corporis nobis dari, quum per fidem Christus totus noster sit: ut si cui ager procul remotus detur, huic vere dicetur, Agri substantia tibi datur: quod de jure intelligitur. THEOPHILUS. Utimur quidem similitudinibus ejusmodi, ut declaremus ad veram ipsius Christi communicationem minime requiri ipsam præsentiam in pane, sive impanationem corporis quam tu somnias. Sed magna fit nobis injuria quum ista non aliter detorques, quam si diceremus hâc similitudine prorsus explicari mysterium nostræ cum Christo conjunctionis, quam tamen toties testati sumus a nobis comprehendi non posse, quamvis spirituale esse, et fide fieri, ex Dei verbo agnoscamus." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 279.)

becomes immediately the *present* food for the soul's hunger, and the very cup of salvation for the soul's thirst.

It fails, too, to represent how in this *taking and receiving* we are verily and indeed made to be one with Christ and Christ with us.

How can any earthly similitude picture aright the heavenly and spiritual reality?

Still such an illustration may help to remove the difficulties which some now feel in this matter, and to justify to all the propriety of that language which speaks of giving, taking, and receiving of Christ's body, though that body be not present in the elements; the "giving, taking, and receiving" telling of a such very real beneficial possession of that which is locally absent, that it fully suffices for all the soul's deep necessities;[1] suffices for it, so to receive the gift of that body crucified, and that blood shed for it, that it may feed on it with the soul's true feeding, and be strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as the body is by the bread and wine.

Faith wants the VERY REALITY *of the* CRUCIFIED BODY OF CHRIST *to feed upon*. It is a mistake to think that because the giving, taking, and receiving are only after a spiritual and heavenly manner, that therefore the thing given to faith, and the thing received by faith, cannot be that *very* THING of which Christ says, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."[2]

The faith that thirsts is to be taught to go to drink of the water of life from the very fountain head, from the very smitten Rock.

Our soul's true hunger is to be taught to feed on that flesh which is meat indeed, by believing that in that flesh, HE was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.

[1] The eating and drinking, which our Saviour speaketh of, must be answerable to the hungering and thirsting. . . . But . . . the hunger . . . is not corporal, but spiritual: Why then should any man dream here of a corporal eating?" (Archbishop Ussher's Works, vol. ii., pp. 430, 431.)

"The Church of England knows no bodily presence in the Sacrament, nor any change of the bread and wine into the natural body and blood of Christ; and all that we are required or have reason to believe concerning this matter is, that the bread and wine after consecration are, by the Divine power and efficacy, made the body and blood of Christ to all *spiritual intents and purposes;* and that he who, with the outward acts of taking and receiving feeds on Him in his heart by faith, does verily and indeed partake of all those graces and blessings which Christ merited for mankind by His death, and which this Sacrament was designed to convey to the true believer." (Rev. Joseph Harrison, 1718; quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 722.)

[2] See Appendix, Note K.

It is flesh, even the very flesh and blood of the Son of God, which has redeemed the world.

He took that very flesh and blood on purpose that He might give them for the life of the world. And there is now no life for the world, no life for our souls, but by being partakers of that Redeeming Gift. To be partakers of the life we must be partakers of the Redemption, and to be partakers of the Great Redemption is to be beneficially partakers of the very redeeming price; or in other words, to take and receive the Redemption of Christ which He has wrought out and purchased by His crucified body and blood, is verily and indeed to take and receive the sacrificed body and blood of Christ. It is to take and receive them verily and indeed for Redemption purposes,[1] that is, for the very purposes for which they were given.

And thus to take and receive them for redemption purposes, that is, to believe in that flesh and blood as given and shed for our soul's peace, is to satisfy the soul's true hunger, by feeding on the soul's true meat.

This is, indeed, to eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood. This is to dwell in Christ and Christ in us. And thus it is that our souls are strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine.

[1] "This is the spiritual (and yet no less true and undoubted than if it were corporal) eating of Christ's flesh, not indeed simply as it is flesh, without any other respect, (FOR SO IT IS NOT GIVEN, *neither would it profit us*,) but AS *it is* CRUCIFIED, and GIVEN *for the* REDEMPTION *of the world*." (Cosin's History of Transubstantiation, ch. i., sect. 6, Works, vol. iv., p. 156.)

"The food that Christ said He would give is His flesh, which He would *give for the life of the world*, viz.: to be crucified and killed; . . . and so giving it, it became meat. The receiving this gift was a receiving of life, for it was given *for the life of the world*. The manner of receiving it is by faith and hearing the word of God, submitting our understanding." (Bishop Jeremy Taylor's "Real Presence," Sect. iii., 17, Works, vol. vi., pp. 36, 37.)

"Our eating and drinking must not only feed upon Christ's body and blood, but upon them, as the one was *broken* and the other was *shed*, as they were *a propitiatory sacrifice*. And then . . . we must draw out of them, and digest in our souls the two comfortable *ends* of the sacrament; that is, first, our assurance that we are in the new covenant; secondly, that our sins are pardoned." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 173; Edit. 1629.)

"Their [the ancients'] meaning is, that neither of these elements . . . can directly cleanse us from our sins by any virtue communicated unto them or inherent in them, but only as they are pledges, or assurances, of Christ's peculiar presence in them, and of our true investiture in Christ by them. . . . If we then receive remission of sins, or purification from our sins, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, (as we always do when we receive it worthily,) we receive it not immediately by the sole serious remembrance of His death, but by *the present efficacy or operation of His body which was given for us, and of His blood which was shed for us*." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., pp. 595, 596; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

It may be said, perhaps, that, after all, the difference may be reduced to very little more than a question of words.[1] True; but, for a question of words, it is one of no small importance, for it involves just THIS question, whether our doctrine does indeed fulfil the requirements of the language of Scripture, and of the declarations of our blessed Saviour.

If it does not so, then let us condemn the language of our Catechism as unsuitable to our doctrine, because our doctrine falls short of what the Scripture plainly teaches.

But if, on the contrary, we are persuaded that our doctrine does truly answer to the words of Christ's teaching, then let us not fear to express it in language, which shall come up to the level of His language.

To shrink from such words, because Papists might use them, and Lutherans might lay claim to them, is too much like conceding, that to teach the doctrine of Papists and Lutherans concerning the Real Presence, is the only way to teach men's hearts to speak as Christ spake, and use such language as He used.

It is right indeed, that, as occasion requires, we should guard such language by teaching, as our Church teaches, very plainly that, "the giving and receiving," is "ONLY after a heavenly and spiritual manner," and that it is by faith, and faith *only*, that there can be any receiving or eating at all. But this ought not to be allowed to detract from the truth that spiritual taking and receiving, is taking and receiving *verily* and *indeed*, and that this eating by faith is the *true* and the ONLY *true* eating of that *very* body which was crucified, and that *very* blood which was shed for the life of the world.

It would be out of place to enter more fully and exactly into this subject here. I am only concerned at present, with showing (as I trust I have sufficiently done) that the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Corporal Presence.

V. It only remains for me now to make good the assertion that the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the "Real Objective Presence."

It would indeed be quite sufficient for our purpose to show that there is nothing here but what belongs to our own teaching—for it would be unreasonable to expect in a Catechism for children, that every answer should be so full and definite as to

[1] See Appendix, Note L.

exclude every error. But yet we may be thankful that in the answer before us there is that which must exclude the error we are now concerned with.

The language of the Catechism cannot, indeed, possibly be reconciled with the views of our opponents, without forcing on the word "faithful" a sense which cannot be allowed.

For unless the word "faithful" be here introduced with no meaning and for no purpose,[1] unless it be mere verbiage in a formula, which in its nature requires brevity, and excludes needless expressions, it must be intended to exclude from participation, those who are not included in its meaning.

Therefore, since the Ritualists believe that the body and blood of Christ are received by wicked persons, void of a lively faith, a laboured effort is made to make the word "faithful" here mean "all baptized members of the Church."

It is confessed on all sides, that by "the faithful" is many times meant the whole body of the professing Christians, and that thus there are two senses of the word "faithful;" *one*, in which it means "all who call themselves Christians;" *the other*, in which it signifies "those who have a true and living faith."

The first is called the strict theological sense; the other the loose and incorrect sense.

By an inversion, I would take the liberty rather to call *that*, the true, correct, theological sense, in which the word stands for those who live by faith; and *that*, the loose and allowable sense, in which it signifies all who profess the name of Christ in His Church.

But name these two senses as we may, *this* we must maintain, that here in the Catechism it has what I call its strict and correct sense—the sense of truly[2] believing Christians. Are we to interpret this word as it stands here, without any refer-

[1] With reference to another point Mr. Keble justly speaks of "tautology, little to be expected in such a document." (On Eucharistical Adoration. Edit. 1867, p. 81.)

To assert that the word "faithful" is "*always redundant*" (Sequel to Kiss of Peace, p. 260), fails to account for, or to justify, such redundancy in a short Catechism.

We are told that King James, conceding the request for an addition to the Catechism, added the following wise and judicious conditions to be observed, "Yet so that the Catechism be made in the FEWEST *and plainest* terms. . . . And herein I would have two rules observed: first, that *curious* and *deep* questions be avoided in the FUNDAMENTAL INSTRUCTION of a people; secondly, that there should not be so general a departure from the Papists, that *every thing* should be accounted an *error* wherein we *agree with them.*" (See Southey's Book of the Church, p. 401, and Cardwell's Conferences, p. 187.)

[2] See Malan's "Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." (Pages 136-145.)

ence to the analogy of the other Sacrament, of which the Catechism has just taught us that for its reception is required "faith,[1] whereby we *steadfastly believe* the promises of God made to us in that sacrament"?

Are we to interpret it without any relation to the answer which comes immediately after, and teaches concerning the same Sacrament, that it is required of those who come to it to examine themselves whether they have a *lively faith* in God's mercy through Christ?[2]

Are we altogether forbidden in our interpretation of these words to take into view previous catechetical formulæ of the Church, the Greater and the Lesser Catechisms of Nowell,[3] the use of which enjoined in Canon 79; and of which, the latter seems to have supplied the basis of the answer before us, in a somewhat longer answer, wherein the word "*faithful*" is used as the beginning, and is explained by "*those who trust in Him*," towards the end.[4]

[1] In Fisher's "Defence of the Liturgy," (1630), Novatus s made to say:—"Another thing in the receiving we dislike, that you say Christ's body and blood is verily and indeed received of the faithful." (Page 172.)

To this Irenæus is made to answer:—

"These words (verily and indeed) refute the common error, making Sacraments bare signs. But these (of the faithful) refell the Lutheran and Papist, who make the reprobate, as well as the elect, partakers of Christ."

And these words of Irenæus are written down as a note on the words in the Catechism, in the MSS. notes of some Anglo-Catholic Divine, in the interleaved Prayer Book, among the Harleian MSS. No. 7311.

[2] Dean Addison writes:—"The necessity of faith is expressly taught you by your first Catechism; where it saith, *That a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ* is required of every communicant: And that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* For it is by faith that you there look upon Him whom God hath set forth to be the Propitiation for your sins." (Christian's Manual, pp. 107, 108; Edit. 1719.)

[3] In Nowell's Larger Catechism it is asked, "Are then the *faithful only* fed with Christ's body and blood?" The answer is, "They only. For to whom He communicateth His body, to them, as I said, He communicateth also everlasting life." (P. S. Edit., pp. 215, 216.)

Mr. Grueber indeed founds an argument on the difference between the expression here and that of our Church Catechism. His words are "Contrast also with the use of Fideles the term 'Soli fideles,' in Noel's Catechism, and the argument from the omission of 'Soli' is irresistible." (Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1856, p. 12.) But by the same argument the Church Catechism may be said to *deny* everything, which, by way of explanation or more advanced teaching, the larger Catechism adds. Moreover, in the larger Catechism of Nowell the word "Soli" does not occur in what may be called the *corresponding* answer, where the words are "ita nunc quoque *fidelibus* in sacra ejus cœna utrumque exhiberi." But a separate explanatory question and answer are brought in to stamp clearly the limited sense of the word thus used. "M: An ergo soli fideles corpore et sanguine Christi pascuntur? A: Soli omnino: cum quibus enim corpus suum, cum iisdem et vitam æternam, ut dixi, communicat." (Jacobson's Edit., pp. 174, 175.)

[4] See above, p. 194.

Is the expression in *this* formulary (intended primarily for the use of young children) to be interpreted without any reference to the words of our Communion Service (intended for communicants) "if with a true penitent heart and *lively* faith we receive that holy sacrament . . . *then* we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood"? Or is it unallowable, in its interpretation, to refer to our Articles (intended for Divines), one of which, teaching with theological accuracy the very same doctrine as that of the answer before us, declares that "to such as *rightly, worthily and* WITH FAITH, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ"; and to make the matter still more clear, teaches also that "the *mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*";[1] and another of which (as if further to remove all possibility of question) pronounces that "the wicked, and such as be *void* of a *lively faith*" in the use of the sacrament, are *in no wise* "partakers of Christ"?

Surely if the language of our Catechism fairly admitted of a question, it were but right and reasonable to look to our Articles for a resolution of the question.

But of these Articles we shall have to treat in a future Paper. It must suffice now to say, that the universal language of English reformed theology on this subject, altogether excludes (as I believe) any other than the strict meaning of the word "faithful" here. For however admissible another sense might be for the same word standing in another place and another relation, where it might naturally admit of such a looser interpretation, the subject to which it is applied necessarily fixes its meaning in this answer.

We know well, how in common things the same word has a sense fixed on it, by the relation on which it stands. We speak of "a *fine* day," "a *fine* prospect," and "a *fine* piece of silk." In each saying we use the same word, depending in each case on its having a separate meaning stamped on it

[1] "As if *no faith*, then verily and indeed no body nor blood of Christ." (Hutton's answer, quoted above, p. 200.)

A Roman Catholic writer says,—"The Articles and the Catechism are perfectly consistent one with another, and there is no necessity for any explanation. The whole statement of the Articles is as follows:—'The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.' Nothing can be plainer. The 'faithful' of the Catechism, according to the phraseology of the Article, are those who have 'faith;' for as faith is the means whereby the reception takes place, it is obvious that without faith there is no reception." ("Dublin Review," Jan., 1869, p. 246.)

by the subject on which we speak; and we do not think it necessary in either case to explain what sense the word bears in the one saying or the other. The relation in which it stands here is enough. So with the word "faithful." The relation in which it stands here is enough. As applied to *Eucharistic reception* it needs no explaining.[1] It *constantly means the same.*

This fixed sense of the word "*faithful*" (in this connexion) arose, no doubt, from what may be called the necessities of the Eucharistic controversy; which entered much into the office of *faith*, and led naturally to the drawing of a clear line of distinction between those who had and those who had not "a lively *faith* in God's mercy through Christ." From this arose the constant use of such expressions as "worthy receivers." And from this it was almost the necessary result, that, as applied to the doctrinal teaching concerning the Lord's Supper and its reception, the word "*faithful*" (in the theological language of the English Reformed Church) came to have its meaning as clearly marked and defined, by the very fact of its standing in such connexion as any word in common use, which, being capable of two senses, is capable (ordinarily and naturally) of one only, when used in one connexion.

Curious eccentricities of language will sometimes come up: and possibly some example may be found of an exceptional use of this word. Though I think I may say, with some confidence, that I never met with one. But if found, it can only be regarded as an eccentricity, and can never avail to affect the meaning of the word, as thus used, in an authorised formulary of our Church.

There is no fear of "*fine*," when applied to *silk*, being understood as equivalent to *not wet*, though it would mean *that*, applied to the weather. Its meaning is not doubtful, because it is spoken of *silk*. So of "faithful" here. Its meaning is not doubtful, because it is spoken of Eucharistic reception. I will venture to ask Mr. Cobb, or Mr. Grueber, or any one

[1] This assertion is confined to English Theology; but, if I mistake not, it will be found to apply to the writings of Continental Reformers also. The reader will not fail to observe how the Confessions of Foreign Reformed Churches constantly use the word "faithful" to signify those who receive the "Res sacramenti;" while the Lutheran confessions, on the contrary, intending to teach the reception of the "Res sacramenti" by *all*, do not use the word "fideles," but "vescentes." See Augustan Confess. of 1531, x., "De cœnâ Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in cœna Domini." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 126.) And the Augustan Confess. of 1650, x., "De cœna Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in cœna Domini." (Sylloge Confessionum, p. 172.)

who maintains the contrary, to bring forward any one passage from any one approved divine of the English Reformed Church, taking in fifty years before and fifty years after the date of this addition to the Catechism,—to bring forward, I say, any one passage where the word "*faithful*" is thus applied to the subject of Eucharistic Reception, and can be shown clearly to bear the sense now claimed for it here. Doubtless, to say this may seem very bold, perhaps even, very presumptuous. Of course, I should not say it, if I were not strongly convinced that fair investigation of this subject will tend to confirm my position. If, however, I am wrong, let me be shewn to be wrong. I hope I shall be found quite ready to acknowledge my error, so far as I may be convicted of error; and to correct any false impression, so far as my words may have conveyed any impression not strictly true.

I must not, however, be misunderstood. I will not be so rash as to deny positively that any such example can exist. I will not be so presumptuous as to affirm that no passage can possibly be brought forward with Mr. Cobb's meaning.

But I do express a firm conviction that whatever may be alleged in support of the other sense, must weigh *very light indeed* against the *enormous preponderance* of passages which will support the strict sense of "*faithful.*"

Sure I am, that if Mr. Cobb enters carefully on the investigation, he will soon find himself surrounded by innumerable passages which can clearly bear only the strict sense.[1] And I will be bold enough to express a very full persuasion, that if any passage should be found bearing the other sense, it will be so like a sort of "*lusus naturæ*,"[2] so like a black swan among its snow-white fellows, that it could scarcely be truly and fairly regarded otherwise, than as an exception which must prove the rule.

But if this be so, then my position is made good; for the Catechism clearly limits participation to the "faithful," and the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence teach plainly, that those who thus limit the reception of the res sacramenti to *faith*, and *those who have faith*, are altogether falling short of the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

[1] To this may be added that "All the numerous Commentaries on the Catechism that have ever been written by archbishops, bishops, and divines of all views and parties, have agreed in interpreting the words as referring to true believers." (See "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 754.)

[2] That Overall meant the word to be understood in its restricted sense, will be quite clear, I think, to all who, in the extract given above, p. 192, have marked his careful limitation of his teaching by the insertion of the words "in recto usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus."

APPENDIX.

Note A, p. 196.

How entirely Laud's declared doctrine fell short of the Real Objective Presence, may be seen in his "Conference with Fisher." In the matter of "the Real Presence," he claims to stand with Calvin, and says, "The Church of England is Protestant too. So *protestants of all sorts* maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." (Page 247. See also pp. 241, 246, 248. Edit. Oxford, 1839.)

To this "Real Presence" of all Protestants, he regarded the *Consubstantiation* of the Lutherans not less than the *Transubstantiation* of Romanists as an unwarrantable addition. (Page 241.)

He appeals as in support of his own view to the words of Cranmer. "If you understand by this word *really, reipsa;* that is, in very deed and effectually; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is indeed and truly present, etc. But if by this word *really* you understand *corporaliter*, corporally in His natural and organical body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is contrary to the holy word of God." (p. 248.)

In like manner he appeals to the language of Frith and Ridley, and then he adds, "And for Calvin, he comes no whit short of these, against the calumny of the Romanists on that behalf. Now after all this, with what face can A. C. say (as he doth) that Protestants deny or doubt of the true and real presence of Christ in the Sacrament?" (p. 249.)

"ALL *sides*," he says, "*agree* in the faith of the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy RECEIVER IS BY HIS FAITH made *spiritually* partaker of the true and real body and blood of Christ, truly, and really, and of all the benefits of His passion." (See p. 241.) By Christ's body and blood he means His body as crucified, and His blood "shed and poured out, and so severed from the body." (See p. 256.)

Compare the heading of Ch. II. of Bishop Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation," "The *unanimous consent of* ALL PROTESTANTS with the Church of England in maintaining a REAL, that is, TRUE, but NOT a *carnal*, Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved by Public Confessions and the best of authorities." And see especially sect. 21.

The Bishop of Llandaff writes, "That he [Cosin] did not hold the

Objective Theory when he wrote the history [of Transubstantiation] is proved by the fact that among the English Divines whom he quotes in order to prove 'clarissime,' as he says, 'that the Protestant Churches, our own among the number, a prisca et Catholica fide nullatenus recessisse' (H. T. 11, v.), he particularly mentions Hooker, whose words I just now quoted: words than which none could be more directly at variance with that Theory." (Bishop of Llandaff's Charge, 1869, p. 128.)

In the matter of the Sacrifice, Laud says, "In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices; one by the priest only; that is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, *represented in bread broken and wine poured out*," [for which he quotes, among other similar testimonies, Jewel's words "not in respect of any *corporal* or fleshly *presence* that is imagined to be there without bloodshedding, but for that it *representeth* and *reporteth* to our *minds* that one and everlasting sacrifice that Christ made in His body upon the Cross"]; "another by the priest and the people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and grace we receive by the precious death of Christ; the third, by every particular man for himself only; and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul. . . . Therefore it is safest to . . . leave the Church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions." (pp. 257-8.)

The Conference with Fisher must represent Laud's matured views. In his last will he directs the Conference to be "translated into Latin and sent abroad," adding "that the Christian world may see and judge of my religion." (See Keble on Eucharistical Adoration, edit. 1867, p. 157; and Laud's Works, Anglo-Cath. Lib., vol. iv., p. 449.)

All this is alleged NOT as evidence that the "Real Presence" of Laud and Cosin did *not* differ *at all* from the doctrine of Calvin and Jewel and "all Protestants;" but *as conclusive evidence* that it DID *differ, very widely indeed* from what is now taught as the "Real Objective Presence." On Calvin's doctrine, see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 57, sqq., and Waterland, vol. iv., pp. 60, 61. On Abp. Laud's doctrine, see Abp. Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., pp. 70, 71.

It may, I think, serve to correct much serious misapprehension, if I append some valuable remarks of Mr. Garbett, respecting the position and teaching of the Divines of the school of Laud. "It arose from the position they occupied, that the Anglo-Catholic Divines delighted to use to the utmost possible extent, the glowing language and broad epithets which many of the primitive Fathers had applied to the Sacraments.

"The Reformers avoided many of these phrases, because of the abuse of them during later periods of the Church. The Anglo-Catholic Divines, anxious to identify themselves as closely as possible with the early Fathers, ostentatiously adopted and defended them. They did not scruple to call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, and the ministry a sacerdotal Priesthood: they occasionally used the phrase

'Real Presence,' which had been carefully avoided in the formularies of the Church, and they talked loftily of priestly absolution. But at the same time they guarded their statements by rigid limitations of the utmost possible importance. Thus, for instance, they are very careful to explain the figurative mode in which alone the early Fathers spoke of our seeing and touching Christ in the Lord's Supper, as Bishop Bramhall points out in the quotation given on page 51 of this publication. They explain, that when they call the Lord's Supper an oblation, they mean what the early Fathers meant, not an oblation of the body and blood of Christ, but an Eucharistical oblation of God's creatures—of bread and wine as an offering of praise to God, as Thorndike, for instance, explains in the quotation given on page 34. They declare that the bread and wine are but signs and representations of the body and blood, and that it is only by a figure of speech that they apply to the sign or representation, what is properly true only of the thing signified and represented, as is seen in the quotation from Bishop Cosin, on page 53. They say that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice, but not of the same kind as the one sacrifice of our Lord made upon the Cross once for all, and not to be 'repeated in any manner whatsoever,' as may be seen in the quotations from Archbishop Laud, on pp. 30, 31, and Bishop Cosin, on p. 32. . . .

"It appears then, that in reading these writers, we must distinguish, but not separate, two things—their broad sweeping lofty statements of the nature and virtue of the Sacraments on one side, and the rigid qualifications with which they guarded them upon the other. The qualifications must govern all the statements, because they are added for that very purpose. It is evident that, if the statements be adopted and the qualifications rejected, a very false impression will be gained of their system of doctrine, and a very false estimate conveyed to others. A quotation from Bishop Bramhall given on p. 32, may be adduced in illustration of this fact. Bishop Bramhall calls the Lord's Supper, 'a commemorative, impetrative, applicative sacrifice.' Standing by themselves, the words would be more than sufficiently startling. But we must read them by the light of the qualification, expressed in a few lines before. 'We profess a commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross; and, in the language of Holy Church, things commemorated are stated as if they were then acted.' So again, 'we acknowledge a representation of that sacrifice to God the Father.' What Sacrifice? 'Why, the Sacrifice of the Cross.' 'We acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it.' Of what? Of 'the Sacrifice of the Cross.' 'We maintain an application of its virtue.' Of the virtue of what? 'The Sacrifice of the Cross.' So that all which Bishop Bramhall meant by the words was, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a means of grace through which the benefits of the Sacrifice of Christ are applied to the faithful recipient. . . .

"I believe that when the statements of the Laudian Divines are fairly interpreted, they are distinguished, as Johnson says, 'substan-

tially and essentially,' from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and equally from the doctrine of modern Sacerdotalism." (Introduction to "Voices of the Church of England," pp. 10-15. See also "Principles at Stake," pp. 11, 12.) The pages of the above extract refer, of course, to Mr. Garbett's book, which will be found well worthy of careful examination.

Dean Goode says, "When he [Bramhall] observes 'a true Real Presence . . . no genuine son of the Church of England did even deny,' he only says what is freely and cheerfully admitted, nay contended for. And what he thought 'a true Real Presence' to be, may be judged of by his adding, that De La Milletière's special adversary Albertinus (or, Aubertin) did not deny it. And what Aubertin's view was, I need not stop to describe." ("On Eucharist," ii., p. 869, note.)

It may serve further to elucidate the real difference between Laudian and Ritualistic Theology, if I subjoin another extract from Laud's writings.

"Nor yet speak I this, as if other Protestants did not agree with the Church of England in the chiefest doctrines, and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman Church; as appears by their several confessions." (Laud's "Conference with Fisher," Sec. 14, p. 41. Edit. Oxford, 1839.)

And with this the reader may be glad to compare the following extract from "Articles addressed to the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury by Archbishop Sancroft." "More especially that they [the clergy] have a very tender regard to our *Brethren* the Protestant Dissenters; that upon occasion offered, they visit them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them: persuading them (if it may be) to a full compliance with our Church, or at least, that whereto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule and mind the same thing. And in order hereunto that they take all opportunities of assuring and convincing them, that the bishops of this Church are really and sincerely irreconcileable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries and tyrannies of the Church of Rome; and that the very unkind jealousies which some have had of us to the contrary, were altogether groundless. And in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them, to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of Peace, for an universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies, and that all they who do confess the Holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the Truth of His Holy Word, may also meet in one Holy Communion, and live in perfect Unity and Godly Love." (Quoted from Sparrow's Collection of Articles, Injunctions, etc.)

Note B, p. 202.

My thanks are due to the Rev. H. O. Coxe, the Librarian, and to Professor Gandell, both of whom have kindly examined for me the

copy of the "Survey" in the Douce Collection in the Bodleian Library.

I have since found a copy in the British Museum. That this book contains no specific exception to the answer before us, is, perhaps, all the more striking from the fact, that the part added to the Catechism at the Hampton Court Conference is strongly objected to. It is objected to as *really* an *addition*, though brought in *nominally* as *explanations*. The "Survey" prefers Nowell's Catechism.

It says of the addition, "this doth smell more of poperie, then those questions and answers which were written by good Maister Nowell."

It questions whether the first answer may not give occasion "to believe more sacraments than two." Also whether it may not give occasion "to believe these two to be absolutely necessary."

It complains that some of the answers "be intricate." It objects to the words "They perform them by their sureties." But no objection whatever is stated to the doctrine taught concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Some particulars concerning this publication will be found in Lathbury's "History of Convocation," pp. 221, 222, 224, 227.

It may tend, I hope, to confirm my argument in the text, if I add here the result of an examination of other works containing Puritan exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer. The books enumerated may be taken, I presume, as fair samples of the rest. But I must not seem to convey the impression of having made anything like a complete investigation of this sort of literature. All I can venture to say is that I have not purposely omitted anything which might be adduced as evidence in this matter; nor have I, I trust, misrepresented anything in the contents of the following books:—

(1) Smectymnus had a great name. It was written by Stephen Marshall, Edward Callamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcommen, and William Spurstow, and takes its name from their initials. "The Old Nonconformist" speaks of it as "famous for the eminent godly and learned authors of it, and especially for its own worth." (Preface.) Some account of it will be found in Neal's "History of the Puritans," chap. viii., vol. ii., p. 27, sqq. It was written in answer to Bishop Hall's "Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament." It was reprinted in 1654 under the title "Smectymnus Redivivus" with an address "To the Reader" by Thomas Manton, who speaks of it as "penned by several worthy Divines of great note and fame." It is concerned with "The *Liturgy* and *Episcopacy*." Of the Liturgy it writes very bitterly, complaining that "many things therein contained are stumbling-blocks before the feet of many: such as these"—(p. 9) enumerating matters objected to. Among these there is nothing said against the teaching of the Catechism. And the exceptions are of generals, rather than of details. It complains, however (p. 70) of the use (by the late Innovators) of the words, *Altar*, *Priest*, *Sacrifice*. It has a postscript, in

which also, there is nothing said against the teaching of the Catechism.

Bishop Hall replied to Smectymnus; in consequence of which was published "A Vindication of the Answer to the humble Remonstrance from the unjust imputation of frivolousness and falsehood, wherein the cause of Liturgy and Episcopacy is further debated." I have only a very imperfect copy of this, but I see no indications of any exception taken to the doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper.

(2) "A motion humbly presented to the consideration of the Honourable the Committee of the High Court of Parliament. Consisting of 18 queres, concerning the Booke of Common Prayer. October 8, 1641."

At the conclusion, it is said, "Many other quærees concerning Matrimony, and concerning Visitation of the Sick and the Buriall of the dead, and the Churching of women might be made."

But no objection is made, and nothing is said of any exception which might be taken, to any answer in the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper.

(3) "Directions propounded and humbly presented to the High Court of Parliament, concerning the Booke of Common Prayer and Episcopal Government, written by a Reverend and learned Divine now resident in this city, London, 1641." This contains moderate proposals for some alterations, but makes no mention of the Catechism. It is very short.

(4) "A trial of the English Lyturgie, wherein all the materiall objections raised in Defence hereof are fully cleared and Answered, London, 1643." This contains nothing concerning the teaching of the Catechism.

(5) "Certain Queres concerning the Booke of Common Prayer, and divers other Articles of Religion, propounded to a Reverend Divine of the City of London, and his modest reply unto the same. London, 1643." The answers in this book point to some things as faulty in the Prayer-book: and speaks of "the great inconveniency which hath followed this booke," but makes no objection to the Catechism.

(6) "A short sober pacific examination of some exuberances in, and ceremonial appurtenances to the Common Prayer, etc., by William Prynne, Esq., a Bencher of Lincolns Inne."

A large portion of this book is taken up with the subject of vestments. Among the objections alleged against the Liturgy I can find nothing against the teaching of the Catechism.

(7) "The first search after one grand cause of the wrath of God yet against his people, in the use of the so much Idolized Liturgie, or Common Prayer." 1644.

This is a short pamphlet and does not much enter into particulars. It contains nothing against the answer of the Catechism.

(8) "LIX. exceptions against the Booke of Common Prayer," May 28th, 1644. This pamphlet contains objections to the Interro-

gatories in Baptism (p. 3), to the words of the Catechism "That the Sonne of God hath redeemed all mankind."

It objects also to "The Catechism (in delivering the number of the Sacraments) saith, there are two onely as generally necessary to salvation." But it contains no objection to the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

(9) "A debate concerning the English Liturgy, both as established in and abolished out of the worship of God. Drawn out in two English and two Latin Epistles written betwixt Edward Hyde, Doctor in Divinity, and John Ley, Rector of the Church of Solyhull in Warwickshire," 1656. This John Ley was one of the Westminster Assembly of Divines; and this book was published by him in defence of the assembly and against the Liturgy. It contains besides the English and Latin letters a preface, and twelve sections of animadversions by Ley. It contains reference to the Hampton Court Conference (p. 58) and strictures on the Liturgy (p. 22), but takes no exception, I believe, to any part of the teaching in the Catechism.

(10) "Common Prayer Book no Divine Service by Vavasor Powell," 1660. This contains objections (p. 21) to the words of delivery in the Communion Service—(to the second part, "Take and eat this," etc., as well as to the first part, "Preserve thy body," etc.). It objects to the second answer in the Catechism. It objects also to the answer "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation." But no objection is alleged to the teaching concerning the Lord's Supper.

(11) "The old non-conformist touching the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies," 1660. This contains—(a) An abridgement of the "Abridgement of that Book which the ministers of Lincoln Diocese delivered to his Majesty King James, the first of December last, being the first part of an Apology for themselves and their brethren that refuse the subscription and conformity which is required, printed in the year 1605." Here is to be found, I believe, no objection to the words of the Catechism. (b) "A Short Table of Sundry other Exceptions which we propose, if God give means and opportunity to justify and confirm in the same manner, as we have done those handled in the Abridgement."

Here are found exceptions to the answer "Two only as generally necessary to salvation," (p. 24), to the words "that infants perform faith and repentance by their sureties" (p. 24), to the words "hereby made children of grace" (p. 25), but no exception to the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper.

(12) "The Common Prayer-book unmasked, wherein is declared the unlawfulnesse and sinfulnesse of it, by several undeniable arguments now newly reprinted, 1660." Of this chap. iv. treats "of the matter contained in it." There is nothing objected to the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper.

(13) "Common Prayer-book Devotions, Episcopal Delusions; or, The Second Death of The Service-book. Wherein, the unlawfulness (with advantage) of the Imposition of Liturgies, or stinted Forms of

Prayer, or of the Worship of God (and more especially of the *English* Service Book) is clearly and plainly demonstrated from the Scriptures, and grounds in Reason," 1666. This contains, I believe, no stricture on the teaching of the answer before us.

(14) To these may be added, "The Harmony between the Old and Present Non-conformists Principles, in Relation to the Terms of Conformity, with Respect both to the Clergie, and the People. Wherein a short History of the Original of the English Liturgy, and some Reasons why several truly Conscientious Christians cannot joyn with the Church in it. Humbly Presented to Publick Consideration in order to the obtaining some necessary Relaxation and Indulgence. To which are added some Letters that pass'd between the Lord Cecil, and Arch-Bishop Whitgift." London, 1682.

This contains five pages on the subject of the Sacraments, taken almost entirely from another publication entitled "The Altar of Damascus," (pp. 12-16). But I find nothing alleged against the teaching of our Catechism concerning the Eucharist.

It does not appear (so far as we may gather from Neal's statement concerning it) that any objection to this answer appeared in the Abridgment of the Apology of the Lincolnshire ministers presented to the king, Dec. 1, 1604 (Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., pp. 426-430); nor in the treatise of Bradshaw entitled "English Puritanism" (Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. i., pp. 432-437).

Neither of these books have I been able to meet with.

Neal makes mention (vol. ii., p. 27) of two pamphlets entitled "A comparison between the Liturgy and the Mass-book;" and "Service Book no better than a Mess of Pottage." But I have not been able to find either of them.

I shall be glad to add to or to correct any statement made here or in the text, if any person, possessing more familiar acquaintance with such writings, will furnish information such as, in any way, materially to affect my argument.

The general character of the works published by the Puritans against the Prayer-book appears to me fully to justify what is said by Mr. Perry:—

"It seems to have been more with respect to some special points connected with the administration of the holy rite, the kneeling posture, the use of private communions, etc., that the Puritans differed from the Church than as to the doctrine of the Sacrament itself." (Perry's "History of the Church of England," vol. i., p. 24.)

Note C, p. 216.

It may be thought right to give some few examples to support the assertions here made:—

I. As to the *res sacramenti* being received, not from the hands of the earthly minister, but from above, and from a Divine Person:—

(a) "He (our Redeemer and Saviour Christ) it is that feedeth continually all that belong unto Him with His own flesh that hanged upon

the cross, and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." (Cranmer in Preface to Lord's Supper, p. 7.) Compare p. 170, where he allows the saying, that "HE (Christ) giveth His body in the Sacrament to such as worthily receive it."

"HE (Christ) giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon." (Ibid. p. 35.)

"Grace is given by the Sacrament; but as by an instrument. The inward virtue and CHRIST give the grace through the Sacrament." (Ridley's Works, p. 239.)

"CHRISTUM asserimus, vere SESE præsentem exhibere in Sacramentis suis: in baptismo, ut eum induamus: in Cœnâ, ut eum fide et spiritu comedamus, et de ejus cruce ac sanguine habeamus vitam æternam." (Jewel's "Apologia." Cambridge Edit., p. 31.)

"THE Lord doth in very deed give the same thing that He doth represent, and so that we do unfeignedly receive the body and blood of Christ." (Coverdale's Translation of Calvin, in Fruitful Lessons, etc., p. 461.)

"In the Supper CHRIST giveth unto us the very substance of His body and blood, that we may with full right possess Him." (Ibid. 441.)

"That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of His whole Church; by Sacraments HE severally *deriveth* into every member thereof." (Hooker, Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 258.)

Compare Calvin:—"If by the breaking of the bread our Saviour doth represent the participation of His body, it is not to be doubted but that HE truly gives and confers it." (Quoted in Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 168.)

Again:—"HE bids me take, eat, and drink, His body and blood which is His Holy Supper He offers me under the symbols of bread and wine: I make no scruple but He doth reach them to me, and I receive them." (Ibid. p. 168.)

Compare Bishop Morton:—"How much more real is the *gift, and receipt* of that benefit, which exhibited unto us in corporal elements, hath the *donor* CHRIST, who is the eternal Son of God; the gift, His precious and glorious body, which is the everlasting ransom of His elect, and is received by faith." ("Catholic Appeal," lib. ii., ch. ii.; sect. 28, p. 131.)

So Jackson:—"The food of life is no other than Christ's body and blood; and it is our High Priest HIMSELF which must give us this food." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 594; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Compare Bishop Bayly:—"The *outward signs* the *pastor gives* in the Church, and thou dost eat with the mouth of thy body; the *spiritual grace* CHRIST *reacheth from heaven*, and thou must eat it with the mouth of thy faith." (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 921.)

So Dr. Waterland:—"It is HE (Christ) that now sanctifies the symbols, as He then did, and, as it were, presides over our eucharistical services, making the bread to become *holy*, which before was

common, and GIVING *the true food* to as many as are qualified to receive it, along with the *symbolical*." (Vol. iv., p. 534.)

(b) Sometimes God the Father is spoken of as the Giver; for example:—"We thank Thee, most gentle and merciful Father, that Thou hast vouchsafed this day of Thine own goodness to feed us with an heavenly meat, even with that very body and blood of Thy most entirely beloved Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." (Becon, "Early Writings," p. 120.)

Hutchinson says:—"We receive Christ's body . . . from heaven from the right hand of the Father; not out of the bread, nor in the bread." (Works, p. 35.)

"Grace is a consequent of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from GOD HIMSELF, the Author of Sacraments." (Hooker; Keble Edit., vol. ii., 257.)

"All receive not the grace of God which receive the Sacraments of His grace. Neither is it ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of Sacraments on any, but by the Sacraments; which grace also they that receive by Sacraments or with Sacraments, *receive* it from HIM and NOT *from* THEM." (Ibid. p. 258.)

[Compare St. Augustine: "Semper dei est *illa gratia* et Dei Sacramentum, hominis autem *solum ministerium;* qui si bonus est, adhæret Deo, et operatur cum Deo; si autem malus est, operatur *per illum* DEUS visibilem sacramenti *formam*, IPSE autem donat *invisibilem gratiam.*" (Quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," vol. i., p. 254.)]

"We take Baptism and the Eucharist . . . (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby GOD when we take the Sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify." (Hooker, vol. ii., p. 258.)

"As for the Sacraments, they really *exhibit;* but for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that *grace* which with them or by them it pleaseth GOD to *bestow*." (Ibid. pp. 352, 353.)

"In the Eucharist we so receive the gift of God, that we know by grace what the grace is which GOD giveth us." (Ibid. p. 348.)

Again:—"Grace is a consequent of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath *receiveth from God himself the Author of Sacraments*, and not from *any other* NATURAL OR SUPERNATURAL *quality* in them." (Ibid. p. 257.)

So Bishop Lake:—"As He [Christ] gave Himself *for us*, so did He give Himself *to us:* for us on the Cross; to us in the sacrament." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 172; Edit. 1629.)

So writes Hammond:—"In that Sacrament GOD really bestows, and every faithful prepared Christian as really and truly receives the body and blood of Christ. As truly as the bishop or presbyter gives me the sacramental bread and wine, so truly doth God in heaven bestow upon me in earth the body and blood of Christ, *i.e.*, the crucified Saviour; not by local motion, but by real communication; not

to our teeth, but to our souls; and consequently exhibits, makes over, reaches out unto us all the benefits thereof; all the advantages that flow to us from the death of Christ." (Practical Catechism, Works, p. 13. Edit. 1684.)

Again:—"That the faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament; which implies not any corporal presence of Christ on the table or in the elements, but GOD'S communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in Heaven bodily, and nowhere else) to us sinners on the earth." (Ibid. p. 126.)

So Bishop Nicholson:—"The Apostle intends to assert and assure a worthy communicant, that as verily as he eats the bread with his mouth, and takes down the wine, so verily GOD IN HEAVEN bestows on him, and communicates unto him the body and blood of his Saviour, and the benefits of that body and blood which in two words, are pardon and grace." (Exposition of Catechism; Oxford Edit. 1866, p. 222.)

Compare Brevint:—"When I look upon the minister, who by special order from God his Master distributes this *bread* and this *wine*, I conceive that thus verily GOD HIMSELF hath both given once His Son to die, and *gives still* the virtue of His death to bless and to save every soul that comes unfeignedly to Him." ("Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," p. 9; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

Bishop Morton quotes Bellarmine as witnessing that the Protestants teach that, "Although the body of Christ be still in heaven, yet is it received in this Sacrament; first, sacramentally by bodily mouths, in receiving the bread, the sign of Christ his body; and by which GOD doth truly, albeit sacramentally, *deliver* unto the *faithful* the real body of Christ, and secondly spiritually to the mouth of the soul by faith, and so they truly and really participate of the substance of the body and blood of Christ." (On Eucharist: Book iv., chap. 1, sect. 3, pp. 214, 215.)

[Compare Calvin:—"Hic notandum est, quod externa actione figurat ac testatur minister, DEUM *intus peragere:* ne ad hominem mortalem trahatur quod Deus sibi uni vindicat. Id etiam prudenter admonet Augustinus. Quomodo (inquit) et Moses sanctificat et Deus? Non Moses pro Deo: sed Moses visibilibus Sacramentis per ministerium suum, Deus autem invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum." (Calvin; Institutes, lib. iv., cap. xiv., § 17, p. 461; Edit. 1618.)]

(c) Sometimes also God the Holy Ghost is spoken of as the Giver; for example:—

"When the minister delivereth unto me *the thing that is in his power to deliver*, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, THE HOLY GHOST *delivereth unto my faith*, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the precious body and blood of my Saviour Jesus Christ spiritually, and not corporally." (Hooper, "Early Writings," p. 191.)

"When we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood . . . *given to us by the work*

of the HOLY GHOST, and received of us by faith, as the mouth of our soul, we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life." (Nowell's Catechism, p. 214.)

Compare Archbishop Sharp:—"When, therefore, our Church speaks of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, she means that the HOLY SPIRIT of Christ is present in the ordinance, to *apply* to every faithful communicant all the benefits of Christ's sacrifice." (Quoted in Garbett's "Voices of the Church of England," p. 61.)

So Bishop Jeremy Taylor:—"These are indeed conveyed to us by the several ministries of the Gospel, but especially in the Sacraments, where the word is preached and consigned, and THE SPIRIT is the TEACHER and the FEEDER, and makes the table full, and the cup to overflow with blessing." (Vol. viii., p. 24.)

So Bishop Lake:—"The proper *Exhibiter* of the heavenly [thing] is the Holy Spirit, and the Receiver is our faith." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, "De Tempore," p. 168; Edit. 1629.)

[After making many quotations from ancient doctors, the *Consensus Orthodoxus* of Gualter says: "Docemur hinc et admonemur, velut visibili verbo, corporalibus, et externis symbolis seu ritibus, res spirituales, et intelligibilia dona, non tantum significari et adumbrari, sed etiam simul offerri, et secreta divinæ ordinationis dispositione, in operanda, et dispensanda fidelium salute, *per Spiritum Sanctum exhiberi* omnibus, qui hisce corporalibus et externis symbolis, juxta institutionem Christi, in fide utuntur." (pp. 317, 318; Edit. 1605.)]

II. As to the taking and receiving being by faith as the hand and mouth of the soul:—

"I say, that Christ giveth himself to be eaten, chewed, and digested; but all is *spiritually* with faith, not with mouth." (Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, p. 15.)

"They say that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine: . . . We say that He is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith." (Ibid. p. 57.)

He [Christ] . . . is holden of the godly . . . with the *hand* of the heart, and by inward drinking is received." (Ridley's Works, p. 223.)

"I say, Christ understood it not of the bodily mouth, but of the mouth of the spirit, mind, and heart." (Latimer, Remains, p. 266.)

"He doth testify, that as verily as we receive the bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and tongue . . . even so by *faith* (which is in place of *hands* and *mouth* to the soul), we verily receive the true body, and the true blood of Christ, our only Saviour." (Rogers on Articles, p. 288.)

"The body of Christ is not eaten with the bodily mouth, but only by faith, which is the spiritual mouth of the soul." (Jewel, "Apology and Defence," p. 531.)

"Spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of Christ and drink His blood, even as verily as His body was verily broken, and His blood verily shed upon the cross." (Jewel, "Sermon and Harding," p. 448.)

"By the *hand of faith* we reach unto Him, and by the *mouth of faith* we receive His body." (Jewel, "Harding Thess. etc.," p. 1119.)

"Thy faith must reach up into heaven. By faith He is seen, by faith He is touched, by faith He is digested." (Sandys's Sermons, p. 89.)

"His body and blood . . . received of us by faith, as the mouth of the soul." (Nowell's Catechism, p. 214.)

"All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh the meaning is: that faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat." (Catechism of Edward VI., p. 33.)

"Behold the holy body and blood of thy God; honour it; wonder at it; touch it (not with thy bodily mouth, but) with thy mind; receive it (not with thy bodily hand, but) with the hand of thy heart; and specially take it with thy inner taste." (Jewel's Rendering of Eusebius Emissenus, "Apology and Defence," p. 549. Compare Homilies, p. 400.)

"A man is shaped of two parts, of the body and of the soul; and each of them hath his life, and his death, his mouth, his teeth, his food, and abstinence. . . . How . . . then will you feed the soul? Doubtless, not by the instrument of the body, but of the soul; for that which is received into the body hath no passage from thence into the soul. . . . And whereas you say that the spirit hath no mouth . . . you are deceived, for the spirit hath a mouth, in his kind. . . . Wherefore, whoso will be relieved by the body of Christ, must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto." (Grindal, Remains, pp. 45, 46.)

"The natural body of Christ is only in heaven; and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant, with her *mouth*, that is to say, with *faith*, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort. . . . *Faith* then is the *mouth* of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten." (Becon's Catechism, p. 295.)

So Jackson:—"Faith then is as the mouth or appetite by which we receive this food of life." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 594; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Again:—"Faith is as the mouth or organ by which we receive the medicine." (Ibid. p. 611.)

And so Bishop Lake:—"We ourselves consist of an earthly and an heavenly part: We must bring both parts into the feast, and there use them both; our bodies must *take*, *eat* and *drink* the elements; our souls must *take*, *eat*, and *drink* the body and blood of Christ." (Bishop Lake's Sermons, p. 173; Edit. 1629.)

With these examples compare the following:—

"That the same true and substantial body of Christ is present with my mind in the Supper, where it is most efficacious, I cannot deny, since it is beyond dispute, that it is really communicated to the minds of the faithful, and is really perceived by them, for it is seen by the eye of the believing mind, or the inner man, and is *taken by*

the hand and *eaten by the mouth of the same.*" (Letter of H. Zanchius to Grindal in "Zurich Letters," ii., 100.)

"As faith is an eye unto which things to come are present, so it is a *hand* holding them, a *mouth* feeding upon them, and a *stomach* receiving them, and uniting them unto the person that believeth." (Dr. Mayer's Exposition, quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," p. 699. See also pp. 700, 701.)

Compare also the following from Swinnock:—

"Faith must receive Christ, and apply Him to thy soul. When thou puttest forth the hand of thy body to take the bread and wine, do thou put forth the *hand* of *faith* to *receive* the body and blood of Christ. This is one principal act of faith, like Joseph of Arimathea, to take Jesus down from the cross and lay Him in the new tomb of thine heart." (Swinnock's "Christian Man's Calling," Works, vol. i., p. 205.)

Note D, p. 217.

Compare the following from Ursinus:—

"There is in the Lord's Supper a double *meat* and drink. One *external*, visible and terrene, namely bread and wine; and another *internal*. There is also a double *eating* and receiving; an external and *signifying*, which is the corporal receiving of the bread and wine; that is, which is performed by the hands, mouth, and senses of the body; and an *internal*, *invisible*, and *signified*, which is the fruition of Christ's death, and a spiritual ingraffing into Christ's body; that is, which is not performed by the hands and mouth of the body, but by the Spirit and faith. Lastly, there is a double *administer* and dispenser of this meat and drink: an *external*, of the external, which is the minister of the Church, delivering by his hand the bread and wine; and an *internal*, of the internal meat, which is Christ himself, *feeding us by his body and blood.*" ("Summe of Christian Religion, by Z. Ursinus," p. 470. London, 1633.)

Compare also this from the "Harmonia Confessionum":—

"Sic enim unica est sacræ Cœnæ actio, ut tamen partim corporalis sit, et in terris peragatur (cujus respectu non dubitamus Christi corpus dicere, a nobis tam procul, quam cœlum a terris, abesse) partim cœlestis, ac mente et fide cor sursum subvehente, perficiatur: Cujus habita ratione præsentissimum esse in Cœna, menti et fidei nostræ Domini corpus agnoscimus." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Obser. 2, p. 144. Geneva, 1581.)

The following extracts from Beza will be found not only to illustrate the sacramental signification spoken of, but also to have a remarkable resemblance to the teaching of our Catechism:—

"Panis est Sacramentum, id est, sigillum et nota veri corporis Jesu Christi . . . Vinum . . . veri sanguinis ipsius pro nobis effusi: fractio panis ostendit pretiosum corpus Domini Magnis Cruciatibus confractum fuisse: vini effusio, sanguinis effusionem: Minister vero panem et vinum nobis donans, repræsentat nobis

Jesum Christum Semetipsum nobis donantem. Quòd verò panem et vinem *recipimus*, *edimus*, *bibimus:* testatur . . . ut eum spiritualiter *amplectamur*, et tamen *verissimè*, illum scilicet *nostrum cibum* in vitam æternam: *sicut panem et vinum* corporeo modo et visibili manducando, *corpus nostrum alitur et sustentatur in hac vita.* Non enim dubitamus quin Deus quod per Verbum suum promittit et per Sacramenta offert, *verè credentibus exhibeat.*" (Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 84.)

"Inde fit, ut quum sola symbola manu accipiantur, et ore sumantur, tamen illud quoque quod præter symbola verè offertur, et solâ fide spiritualiter percipitur, *Accipi*, *Comedi*, *Bibi* dicatur." (Vol. i., p. 209.)

"Neque *hæc tantum* symbola, sed etiam præter illa, corpus suum et sanguinem nobis offert fruendum hunc possidendum in vitam æternam, quam ex eo nobiscum communicato haurimus." (Vol. i., p. 209.)

"Id est, non imaginarium aliquod corpus, nec fictus sanguis, sed illud ipsum corpus quod traditum est pro nobis, et ille ipse sanguis pro nobis fusus, quorum simus *vere* per fidem participes, sicut symbola verè testantur." (Vol. i., pp. 209, 210,—see p. 624.)

Compare also the following from Beza's Catechism :—

"Qu. *Quid in Cœna Domini vides?*

"R. Panem et vinum, quæ præbentur juxta Dei præscriptum.

"Qu. *Quid tibi panis hic et hoc vinum significant?*

"R. Panis, corpus pro me crucifixum, vinum sanguinem pro me effusum mihi significant.

"Qu. *Quorsum?*

"R. Ut testentur mihi ac confirment, sicut huic pani atque huic vino attributæ sunt nos in vita conservandi partes, ita Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum corpus suum et sanguinem suum pro me dedisse, et seipsum mihi dare ut ab ipso in me vita æterna promanet." (Tract. Theol., vol. i., p. 693.)

The following quotations will show how firmly Beza held the truth of the real giving and receiving, not merely of the benefits, but of the *res sacramenti* itself.

"Neque putamus nos posse donorum et virtutis Christi participes fieri, nisi id ipsum in primis possideamus." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 216.)

"Quasi qui virtutem illam vivificam Christi dicit ad nos ex Christi carne manare, carnis communicationem tollat, ac non potius ostendat cur et in quem finem nobis communicetur." (Ibid. p. 223.)

"Falso nobis tribuis quod Christum ipsum a suis donis separemus, quasi nos non oporteat ipsi in primis uniri: ut jam ad fastidium usque declaravimus. . . . Separas quæ individuo vinculo sunt semper conjuncta, nempe Christi corpus et sanguinem a vivifica ipsorum virtute." (Ibid. p. 227,—see p. 267.)

"In eo assentimur, quod . . . præter panem et vinum dicis non tantum meritum et efficaciam mortis Domini, sed ipsum etiam corpus et sanguinem nobis communicari." (Ibid. pp. 259, 260,—see p. 286.)

"Iterum et iterum inculco, nos minime diffiteri veram veri corporis

et sanguinis Christi κοινωνίαν, sed impanationem . . . oppugnare." (Ibid. p. 260,—see also p. 261.)

"Jam antea millies respondi, nos quoque veram veri corporis et veri sanguinis communicationem statuere, et putidam esse calumniam quam nobis impingitis de sola sive nuda meriti et Spiritus Christi perceptione." (Ibid. p. 266,—see p. 279; and vol. ii., pp. 140, 186.)

"Quasi vero centies millies non sit *a nostris omnibus* et singulis inculcatum, quum ex una Christi carne petenda sint nobis quæcunque ad salutem et vitam æternam requirantur, ipsimet Christo prius oportere nos spiritualiter ac per fidem uniri, ac ipsius membra fieri quam ejus spiritu vivificemur: ac proinde signa hæc non esse duntaxat ipsius energiæ, sed in primis ipsiusmet corporis ac sanguinis Domini fide participandi symbola." (Ibid. vol. viii., p. 52.)

Not only did Beza thus (after Calvin) constantly teach and firmly maintain the true giving, taking, receiving, eating, and drinking of the *res sacramenti* itself (as distinguished from the fruits, effects, and benefits alone); but he allowed the language which speaks of such giving and receiving *with* or *under* the forms or signs or symbols of the elements.

He would certainly, I think, have sanctioned as *admissible* and *defensible*, the language of Foxe as quoted in Paper No. V., pp. 151, 152, and the language of the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies. Only he would have required the receiving the *res sacramenti* UNDER the elements should be *well expounded*. His words are (after explaining why "has formulas veremur usurpare")—"Posse tamen videtur, concordiæ causa, *Cum* et *Sub* admitti, sed non nisi adjuncta interpretatione plana et perspicua, nempe ita eas particulas esse intelligendas, non quasi caro Christi in terris statuatur, sed ut sciamus præter ipsa symbola quæ sunt in terris, Christum ipsum qui est in cœlis, verè nobis donari, *sicut symbola in terris testificantur.*" (Tract Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 208.)[1]

It may be worth while to add here, that Archbishop Leighton also (1) not only clearly taught the reception of the *res sacramenti* itself in the Lord's Supper, (2) but also admitted the expression "*under*" as applied to the symbols or elements.

The following answer from his "Short Catechism" summarizes the teaching of three answers in the Church Catechism:—

"Q. What doth the Lord's Supper signify and seal?

"A. Our spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, and transforming us more and more into His likeness, by commemorating His death, and *feeding* on *His body and blood*, *under* the *figures* of bread and wine." (Leighton's Works, vol. iii., pp. 417, 418; Edit. 1818.)

Let the reader be asked to compare the latter part of this answer—

(1) With the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, "Of the due Receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood under the Form of Bread and Wine." Has one any more of a "Real Objective" sound than the other?

(2) With the answer we are considering in our Church Catechism. Is not the language of the Church Catechism far *less* open to the

charge of teaching "the Real Objective Presence," (*a*) from its avoiding such ambiguous expressions as "*under the forms*" or "*under the figures*," (*b*) from its more guarded wording in limiting the reception to the "faithful"?

Note E, p. 217.

The writer of No. V. of "Tracts for the Day," writes:—

"There is 'the body of Christ'; the person 'giving,' and the person 'taking and eating.' The person 'giving' is evidently the priest, who is enjoined by an express rubric to 'give' the Communion to the people 'into their hands.' The person 'taking' is the communicant, who is to 'take and eat' what the priest hath 'given into his hand,' which *the Article says* is 'the body of Christ.'" ("Tracts for the Day," v., pp. 26, 27.) But if this writer will read the Article again, he will see that it never says that what *the priest gives* is the body of Christ. Nor would any of our Reformers have thought of meaning or saying such a thing, except in that sacramental language, which gives to the sign the name of the thing signified.

On such a supposition, how could it be said (in the natural and obvious meaning of the words) that the *giving, taking, and eating* is "ONLY *after an heavenly and spiritual manner*"? Surely such a giving would be (*in part*, at least) after an earthly and bodily manner.

And how, on such a supposition, could it be true (in its natural and obvious sense) that "THE *mean*, whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith"? Surely the bodily hand must be (primarily) THE *mean*, whereby *that* is received which by the bodily hand is *given*.

Mr. Machonochie writes:—"I believe, and therefore have always taught you, that the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST are *objectively* 'given' by the priest, *objectively* 'taken' by every communicant, and subjectively 'received and eaten by faith' unto salvation, by such as come to the Lord's Supper with right dispositions." (Address; January, 1867, p. 5.)

If for "objectively" we might substitute the word "sacramentally," in the sense of our Reformers (see Paper No. II., pp. 60-63), we should have here sound teaching, in harmony with all our formularies; but without such a substitution the words bear a sense which our Church (as I am persuaded) does not teach, and which would have been utterly disclaimed by our English Reformers.

The late Bishop of Salisbury appears to have been misled in the same way, when he says, "The word 'given' seems to me to be only consistent with the 'doctrine of an objective presence.'" (Charge, p. 81. See also Liddon's Memoir, "W.K. Hamilton," p. 122.)

And thus Mr. Luke Rivington says:—"There are three steps—the giving, the taking, the receiving. The Lord's body therefore must, awful as is the truth, be in the priest's hands before it is in the heart of the communicant!" ("Inward Part or Thing Signified," p. 9. See also Bishop Forbes on Articles, vol. ii., p. 537.)

So Mr. Cobb says in "Sequel to Kiss of Peace," p. 401, note:—"The objective character of the phrases 'given, taken and eaten,' would, to my mind, necessitate an objective sense being given to the words 'heavenly and spiritual.'"

But precisely the same English expression as in the English version of the Article—"given . . . taken, eaten,"—is found also in Nowell's Smaller Catechism, where no one will contend that it bears any *Real Objective* sense. (See above, p. 196.)

And precisely the same Latin expression as in the Latin version of the Article—"datur et accipitur"—is found also in the "Consensus Orthodoxus" of Rodolph Gualter (see Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 623. Geneva, 1681) first published in 1578. And the following extract will satisfy any one that it bears there no *Real Objective* sense:—"Non est talis præsentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in cœna ponenda et statuenda, quam spiritualis cibi et potus ratio non requirit, quæque ad verum communicationis ipsius effectum nec necessaria nec utilis est. At *spiritualis* cibi et potus *ratio*, secundum quam corpus et sanguis Christi in cœnâ DATUR ET ACCIPITUR, *nullam* plane *requirit* CORPORALEM *in symbolis præsentiam*, neque etiam ejusmodi præsentia vel necessaria vel utilis est ad verum atque proprium communicationis corporis et sanguinis Christi effectum." (Page 227, Edit. Zurich, 1605.)

The reader may observe that the expression here "spiritualis ratio" presents another point of coincidence with the language of our Article.

But long before this Bucer had taught, "quod . . . simul *detur* et *accipiatur* corpus Christi." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1535, in Works, vol. iv., p. 231. Geneva, 1581.)

Moreover, even Œcolampadius had said before "Cum pane etiam ac vino *συμβολικῶς* . . . et contemplatione fidei, corpus et sanguinem *tradi* et *accipi* dicimus." And he declares, "non sine summa contumelia et dolore audiamus, *non accipere* nos in Cœna *verum corpus*." (See his letter to Bucer in Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1530, in Works, vol. iv., p. 188. Geneva, 1581.)

That Reformed Divines—Divines distinctly opposed to the Real Objective Presence—did not hesitate to speak of "*giving*" as well as of "*reception*," will be abundantly clear to all who will refer to the quotations given above, in pp. 218, sqq. See also p. 244.

Bishop Forbes indeed (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 558) argues that Calvin's *accipio* is *receive*, not *take*. But the "is taken" of our English Article xxviii. is the "*accipitur*" of the Latin version.

Moreover, it is to be observed that, in the very same Article, and in the very same sentence, the same word "*accipitur*" in the Latin is once rendered by the English "is taken," and once by the English "is received."

I submit, therefore, that every argument must be futile which rests on such an assumption as this, that the two English expressions "taken" and "received" must necessarily (in the theological language of the time) convey two separate notions, having a definite and clearly marked line of distinction between them.

Further, I submit, that the claim of any such exclusively "Real Objective" sense for the English expression "taken" is abundantly refuted by the extract given from Sibbes in p. 221, as well as by several of the extracts given above in pp. 212, 213; and below, pp. 260-265.

Let me add, that Beza would admit to the *very full* the utmost meaning that can be attached to the English word "*taken*." For he speaks of the sacraments "utpote quæ nos veluti in rem præsentem adducant, quasi Christum ipsum quodammodo manibus jam palpemus, et oculis cernamus, et toto corpore sentiamus." (Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i. p. 26.)

Again he says—"Agnus denique ipse nobis per illa commonstratus et velut in manus traditus: spiritualis per fidem illius agni manducatio." (Vol. ii., p. 187.)

How could Beza have expressed more clearly the *reality* of that spiritual "*taking*"? This will be found, I think, to answer sufficiently what is argued from "that little work '*taken*'" in "The Kiss of Peace," pp. 22, 23; Edit. 1868.

Let it be added, that the language which Mr. Cobb quotes from Article xxviii.—"after an heavenly and spiritual manner" ("cœlesti et spirituali ratione," *Latin version*)—and which he would have to receive a "Real Objective" impress, is the very language which Beza also uses. He says:—

"Modum quidem dicimus esse *spiritualem cœlestem* divinum." (Beza, Tract. Theol. Genev., 1582, vol. i., p. 275.)

Again:—"Quemadmodum *accipimus, edimus et bibimus* naturalia symbola . . . ita etiam *cœlesti et spirituali* modo Jesus Christus . . . vere nobis communicatur." (Ibid. p. 31.)

Bucer also had said, "Ego in omnibus meis scriptis testor; præcipuum in sacra Cœna esse exhibitionem corporis et sanguinis Christi realissimam, quia *cœlestem et spiritualem*. . . . Panis ostenditur et præbetur sensibus, et simul *fidei* exhibetur et traditur corpus Domini." (See his letter in Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1533, Works, vol. iv., p. 215. Geneva, 1581.)

But it is specially to be observed that the same expression is found in Nowell's Smallest Catechism (see above, p. 196) where the *giving, taking, eating, and drinking* are said to be "only in *a heavenly and spiritual manner*, but yet in truth."

If it be argued further that the word "eaten" at any rate is not in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," and must have an objective sense, since Bishop Forbes (On Art., vol. ii., p. 558) says—"The 'taking' and 'eating' are two distinct acts;" it will suffice to refer to the quotations in pp. 248-250, and below, pp. 269-271, for evidence to show how constantly "eating" is spoken of as *by believing only*. Or the reader may be referred to the words quoted above (p. 206) from Jewel, speaking of the *giving indeed and verily*, of *eating verily*, and of the *drinking verily*. Or he may find in Cranmer's work "On the Lord's Supper," under the section "Of the Eating and Drinking," conclusive evidence that in the language of the English Reformation such words carried no "Real Objective" sense.

It may be observed, too, that Zwingle himself uses the word *eating* (edere) to express his own view, in the quotation given above in p. 193, and below, (in Hospinian), p. 258.

It may be worth while, perhaps, to add the following extracts from Calvin, to show what a *very real*, and yet what an *entirely spiritual* office was assigned to *eating* in his teaching :—

"Summa sit, non aliter animas nostras carne et sanguine Christi pasci, quam panis et vinum corporalem vitam tuentur et sustinent. Neque enim aliter quadraret analogia signi, nisi alimentum suum animæ in Christo reperirent: quod fieri non potest nisi nobiscum Christus verè in unum coalescat, nosque reficiat *carnis suæ edu* et *sanguinis potu*. . . . Si verum est præberi nobis signum visibile, ad obsignandum invisibilis rei donationem: *accepto corporis symbolo*, non minus corpus etiam ipsum nobis *dari* certò confidamus." (Instit., lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 10.)

"Si oculis animisque in cœlum evehimur, ut Christum illic in regni sui gloriâ quæramus, quemadmodum symbola nos ad eum integrum invitant, ita sub panis symbolo *pascemur ejus corpore*, sub vini symbolo distincte *ejus sanguine potabimur;* ut demum toto ipso perfruamur." (§ 18.)

"Aliud est offerre, aliud *recipi*. Spiritualem hunc cibum omnibus porrigit Christus, potumque spiritualem propinat: alii avide *vescuntur*, alii fastidiosè respuunt." (§ 33.)

"Sunt qui manducare Christi carnem, et sanguinem ejus bibere, uno verbo definiunt nihil aliud esse quam in Christum ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus in præclarâ illa concione, ubi carnis suæ manducationem nobis commendat: nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari: quam manducandi etiam ac bibendi verbis ideo designavit, ne quam ab ipso vitam percipimus, simplici cognitione percipi quispiam putaret. Quemadmodum enim non aspectus sed esus panis corpori alimentum sufficit: ita vere ac penitus participem Christi animam fieri convenit, ut ipsius virtute in vitam spiritualem vegetetur. *Interim verò hanc non aliam esse quam fidei manducationem fatemur: ut nulla alia fingi potest.*" (Lib. iv., cap. xvii., § 5.)

"Neque illi mihi satisfaciunt, qui . . . nos Spiritus modo participes faciunt, preterita carnis et sanguinis mentione. Quasi vero illa omnia de nihilo dicta forent, *Carnem* ejus verè esse *cibum*, *sanguinem* ejus vere esse *potum:* non habere vitam nisi qui carnem illam *manducaverit*, et sanguinem *biberit:* et quæ eodem pertinent." (§ 7.)

Very *real* also is the *spiritual* manducation taught in the "Consensus Orthodoxus," of Gualter.

"Nisi vera esset hæc, quamvis figuratè sic dicta, carnis et sanguinis Christi, quæ fideli corde suscipitur, manducatio et potatio, frustratoria esset ejus in participatione Eucharistiæ ore facta professio." ("Consensus Orthodoxus," p. 204; 1605.)

"Sicut hoc de *verâ* et naturali *carne* . . . et *non de merito*, seu *fructu carnis* intelligi omnino oportet: Ita quoque spiritualis manducatio est *ipsius veræ*, atque propriæ *carnis* Christi." (Ibid. p. 359.)

It will be seen also by references to p. 263 sqq., that the Consensus approves of the phrase "edere carnem," and of the saying "Fides edit carnem Christi, et bibit sanguinem ejus, dum credit."

I cannot but think that the reader who carefully considers the teaching of these extracts and those given above (pp. 250, 251) from Beza, will come to the conclusion that Bishop Forbes (On Articles, vol. ii., p. 558) is in error in regarding the formula of Poissy (so far as regards the words "nos *recipere* et *edere* spiritualiter et per fidem verum illud corpus quod pro nobis mortuum est") as "not a genuine 'reformed' statement;" if by this is meant, that there is anything in the words really discordant with the views of the Reformed. (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 61.) Compare the extract given above from the Belgian Confession (p. 209), as well as the other extracts from the Reformed Confessions.

I do not doubt, however, that Bishop Forbes is perfectly right in speaking of the *hollowness* of the attempt "to state the Calvinistic doctrine, so that it might pass with the Queen Mother, and the French politicians, and the Gallican divines." Doctrines so very widely separate from one another may be brought very near together indeed in words, but the show of reconciliation must always be utterly *hollow*.

Note F, p. 219.

I desire, however, to have it quite clearly and unmistakably understood that what is said in the text is intended to apply, not at all to the language which *speaks*, or (to avoid misunderstanding) *prefers* to speak, of the reception and possession of *benefits;* but only to *such* language as rejects or refuses, or explains away, or (in some way or other) sets itself in opposition to, *that* language which speaks of the real beneficial donation, and reception, and possession of that which is the true "res sacramenti."

Bishop Hooper writes:—"Satis absque dubio manducat et bibit in Eucharistia qui corporis et sanguinis Christi *gratiam* efficaciter manducat et bibit, licet corporis substantiam non apprehenderit ore et ventre." (Later Writings, p. 434.)

And again:—"In cœna Domini Spiritus Sanctus per verbum et externa elementa panis et vini recipientis animum per fidem corpore et sanguine Christi, vel *potius* omnibus meritis et bonis in morte sua nobis partis, pascit ac refovet." (Ibid. p. 410.)

Yet Bishop Hooper, as we have seen (see above, p. 205) in his "Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith," published in 1550, did not hesitate to say "I believe and confess . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood." (Later Writings, p. 49.)

So also John A Lasco manifested a decided preference for the language which speaks of the reception of the *benefits* rather than of the "*res sacramenti*" itself.

Yet even A Lasco did not hesitate to write, that the merits of Christ's passion and death and resurrection "ad nos pertinere nullo modo potuissent, nisi ille eorum nobis communionem in corpore et sanguine suo (a nobis hac fine accepto) gratuito (pro suâ misericordiâ) detulisset." ("De Sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi." Fo. 47, b; London, 1552.) And again, "Neque vero ideo, quod vocem communionis passive accipiendam esse dicimus, ipsam corporis et sanguinis Christi exhibitionem excludimus ab usu nostrorum sacramentorum, quæ enim esset societas, ususque communionis, si id non haberetur in quo communionem habemus: ac rursum quomodo haberetur, si non exhiberetur? fatemur igitur exhibitum nobis esse jam olim, adeoque exhiberi semper, omnium autem significantissime in usu Sacramentorum, corpus et sanguinem Christi Domini, alioqui usum illius habere non possemus, nisi exhiberetur." (Ibid. Fo. 44, b.)

Again:—"In hoc . . . omnes consentiunt, quod hanc nostram cum Christo Domino communionem statuunt, in unius ejusdemque corporis et sanguinis societate seu participatione." (Ibid. Fo. 33, a.)

To those who, in our own day, can hardly bring themselves heartily to approve the language which speaks clearly of the reception of the *res sacramenti* itself, I would beg leave to submit for study and consideration, the following observations of Hospinian, on the *seeming dissent* but *real consent*, between the doctrines of Calvin and Zwingle.

"Sunt qui mediam quandam sententiam inter Lutherum et Zuinglium eum [Calvinum] docuisse affirment; sed hoc vel ex imperitiâ, vel malitia faciunt. Nam a Zuinglii sententia (si rem ipsam spectes) ne hilum quidem, quod Calvinus tradidit, discrepare, quamvis paulo planius quid in Sacramento percipiatur definiat ipse; vel summus ille et perpetuus Tigurinæ et Genevensis Ecclesiæ Consensus de re Sacramentariâ confirmat. Passim quidem inculcat Zuinglius, CŒSAM *Christi carnem nos a cæde servare*, COMESAM *nihil prodesse: veram illam ac realem carnem Christi ne spiritualiter quidem edi: carnis et sanguinis nominibus mortem ipsam significari: carnem Christi manducare nihil aliud esse quam credere*, et si quæ sunt similia. His autem contraria videtur Calvinus affirmare, *Carnem Christi* videlicet *quæ crucifixa est oportere a nobis comedi:* VERAM SUBSTANTIAM *carnis nobis spiritualiter communicari: Christum ipsum non esse a suis donis separandum, manducationem esse fidei effectum.* Nullam autem in his esse repugnantiam, non difficile est sani judicii hominibus demonstrare. Comesam ubique carnem vocat Zuinglius ex adversariorum sensu, quæ sive sensibili sive spirituali modo in nostra corpora trajiciatur: Et recte negat hoc sensu carnem quicquam prodesse, quoniam mactata est in ara crucis, ut semel ejus morte non autem comestione aut esu servaremur. Hoc Zuinglii dictum qui ex pravo affectu sinistrè accipiebant olim, concludebant inde, eum simpliciter negare omnem carnis manducationem, quod quidem esset ipsa Christi verba inficiari: Nec unquam illi in mentem hoc venit. Ideo comedendam etiam carnem asseruit Calvinus: sed simul quid vocabulo manducationis carnis et sanguinis Christi intelligeretur perspicue declaravit: nempe, non oris

aut dentium ullam actionem, non substantiarum trajectionem, aut permixtionem, aut inter se applicationem, sive corporali sive spirituali modo factam, sed spiritualem illam κοινωνίαν, quâ fit, ut ille ipse Christus Deus et homo crucifixus pro nobis, vere noster fiat, adeo quidem arctè ut ex ipso quicquid ad salutem nostram requiritur, ipsaque adeo vita æterna in nos promanet, qui spiritualis nexus similitudine membrorum et capitis, itemque matrimonialis copulæ adumbratur. Quæ est igitur in istis repugnantia? Ejusmodi certe esum a Zuinglio minime repudiari ex scriptis ejus liquet. Nam in libro De vera et falsa Religione, et in Historia de Passione; *Christus*, inquit, *aperte docuit, spiritus esse comestionem, non oris.* Item, *Spiritualiter Edimus, quum per Dei gratiam ad Christum venimus.* Item, *Pii non solum symbola dentibus premunt, sed ultra symbolorum manducationem quæ corporis fit, intus in mentibus suis corpore et sanguine Christi per fidei manducationem pascuntur.*

"At objiciat aliquis, corporis et sanguinis nomine Zuinglius ubique testatur, se non ipsam carnem, sed Christi mortis efficaciam atque adeo interdum spiritum, id est spiritualem vim Christi Dei et hominis intelligere. Respondeo, ne hoc quidem Calvini sententiæ repugnare, si dextre et ex Zuinglii mente intelligatur. Quis enim eum fuisse Zuinglium existimet, qui vel Christum diviserit, vel eorum quæ Christus pro nobis implevit efficaciam ab ejusdem carne re ipsa sejunxerit, ac si fides nostra in passionem ita ferretur, ut carnem ipsam quæ passa est negligeret? Res autem sic se habet. Zuinglius adversus sarcophagos agens, quorum duo genera esse videbat: unum eorum, qui crasso quodam modo, et ut ait Nicolaus Papa, sensualiter comedi carnem Christi sub panis et vini speciebus crederent, cujus tamen erroris ipsum quoque Cajetanum poduit: alterum eorum, qui spirituali et incomprehensibili quodam modo substantiam ipsam carnis re ipsa in pane præsentem manibus et ore sumi somniant, ex quo errore tandem natum videmus Ubiquitatis monstrum: totus in eo fuit nimirum, ut spirituale hoc mysterium esse declararet, ideoque substantiæ ipsius usum est inficiatus, quatenus videlicet ab adversariis statuebatur. Hujus rei gratiâ Calvinus cum Zuinglii sententiam a nonnullis male intelligi videret, ac si corpus Christi in spectrum vel certe in abstractum quiddam transformaret, quod nunquam certe illi in mentem venerat; clarius id quoque studuit explicare. Itaque fidem nostram imprimis in ipsummet Christum ferri docuit, secundario vero in ipsius merita et obedientiam, in ea denique omnia quæ ex ipso in nos, qui ipsius membra sumus, promanant. Usus est autem de industria SUBSTANTIÆ vocabulo, quoties præsertim illi cum sarcophagis negotium fuit, *partim insistens Christi vestigiis*, qui carnis, et corporis, et sanguinis nomina sic usurpavit: partim vero, ut eò dilucidius illa inter ipsummet Christum et ejus dona, sive (ut ita loquar) inter subjectum et accidentia, sive inter fundum et fructus distinctio appareret. Et certe cum ab ipso Christo pendeat (Christus autem per carnem sive in carne nobis appropinquat) quicquid ex ipso per fidem tum in verbo simplici, tum in Sacramentis spiritualiter haurimus, *magis proprie loquimur*, quum IPSAM CARNEM et IPSUM SANGUINEM,

sive ipsum Christum sic ab ea parte in qua pro nobis passus est descriptum, statuimus pro re significata tum verbi simplicis, tum sacramentorum : quam quum fructum et efficaciam illius pro re Sacramenti ponimus." ("Historia Sacramentaria," Pars ii., Anno 1541 ; Hospinian's Works, vol. iv., pp. 317, 318. Geneva, 1681.)

This extract may be regarded, I think, as very important. And its value consists,—I. Not only in its pointing out clearly the real substantial agreement in doctrine between two schools (the Swiss and the Calvinistic) ; one of which decidedly preferred the language which speaks of receiving *the benefits*, the other of which clung tenaciously to the language which speaks of the reception of the "res sacramenti" itself,—II. But also in its containing the acknowledgment of a Swiss, that to speak of the reception of the body and blood of Christ themselves is (1) to follow the example of the Great Teacher, and (2) to use that language which is, strictly speaking, the most proper language to be used on the subject.

Let it be well considered, that that which is to be regarded as the true "res sacramenti" (*i.e.*, the *body* AS *crucified*, and the *blood* AS *shed*), which is *truly given*, and *verily and indeed received* by faith, in the giving and receiving of the *sacramentum* (or outward sign), is notwithstanding the *true* sacramental union (see "Harmonia Confessionum," Obser. i. in p. 127) not only, in respect of the elements, *absent* but *distant ;* and DISTANT *not in* PLACE *only, but in* TIME ; though most truly present to the faith of the receiver's soul (see "Harmonia Confessionum," Obser. ii. in p. 144), so as to become immediately the substantial food of its hunger, and the real refreshment for its thirst. And then it will be obvious, I think, that the *giving, taking*, and *receiving* can be understood *no otherwise* than "*only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner ;" and that the real difference between the language (as modified) of the two schools, is a difference rather in the choice of forms of expression, than in anything more important ; though, doubtless, there has been language used, on one side at least, which requires *a favourable construction* to be put upon it, before a harmony can be effected.

The language of *that* school of the Reformed, both at home and abroad, which (though utterly renouncing everything like the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence) clung to the most strictly *proper* language on the subject of the Eucharist, will be found habitually rising to the level (sometimes, I think, higher than the level) of the language of our Catechism, and of the corresponding teaching in our Articles. The same kind of language is used also, not unfrequently, by the Swiss school.

This is so important to be observed, that I will adduce here a few additional testimonies—such as, I hope, will satisfy all that such language has on it *no mark* of its being the *property* of either Romish or Lutheran doctrine.

(1) The following is the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism :—

"*Cur ergo Christus panem appellat suum corpus, calicem vero suum*

sanguinem, seu novum fœdus per suum sanguinem: Paulus item panem et vinum communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi?

"Christus non sine gravi causa sic loquitur: videlicet, non solum ut nos doceat, quemadmodum panis et vinum corporis vitam sustentant, sic etiam *crucifixum* suum *corpus* et *effusum* suum *sanguinem* vere esse animæ nostræ *cibum* ac *potum*, quo ad vitam æternam nutriatur: verum multo magis, ut hoc visibili signo ac pignore nobis certum faciat nos *non minus* VERE *corporis et sanguinis sui*, per operationem Spiritus Sancti, *participes* esse, quam sacra ista symbola, in ejus memoriam, ore corporis percipimus: tum etiam, quod ejus passio et obedientia tam certo nostra sit, quam si ipsimet pro nostris peccatis pœnas dedissemus, et Deo satisfecissemus." ("Catechesis Heidelbergensis," Qu. 79, in "Sylloge Confessionum," p. 380.)

(2) So Ursinus says,—"It is apparent that they are falsely accused who thus teach [*i.e.*, teach the *real spiritual* RECEIVING *of Christ's very* BODY ITSELF] as if they made either the bare signs only to be in the Lord's Supper, or a participation of Christ's *death* only, or of His *benefits*, or of the *Holy Ghost*, excluding the *true, real, and spiritual communion of the* VERY BODY *of Christ* ITSELF." ("Summe of Christian Religion," London, 1633, p. 471.)

(3) Again, Ursinus sets it down among the points "wherein the Churches which profess the Gospel *agree*,"—"that in the Supper we are *made partakers* not only of the Spirit of Christ and His satisfaction, justice, virtue, and operation, but also of the very SUBSTANCE *and essence* of *His true body and blood*, which was *given for us to* DEATH *on the cross*, and *which was* SHED *for us;* and are truly fed with the selfsame unto eternal life." (Ibid. p. 479.)

(4) Calvin says that the *doubt* concerning the *word* SUBSTANCE is readily allayed, if we put away gross imagination of *carnal manducation*. He says that the definition must stand that we are *made* PARTAKERS *of Christ's flesh* SUBSTANTIALLY. ("De verâ participatione," etc.) His words are—"Definitio igitur statuenda erit, *Substantialiter* nos fieri *carnis* Christi *participes* . . . quia non secus animas nostras vivificet Christi *caro*, quoad vim et efficaciam, ac panis vinique substantiâ corpora aluntur." Again:—"Certe, veritas et res Sacramenti, *non tantum* est applicatio *beneficiorum* Christi, sed *Christus ipse* cum morte et resurrectione sua." (See Calvin's Works, vol. viii., p. 744; Amsterdam, 1667.)

A few other extracts (out of many) from Calvin's minor treatises are added.

(*a*) "Respondebimus, panem et vinum signa esse visibilia, quæ corpus et sanguinem Christi nobis repræsentant, corporis vero et sanguinis nomen eis attributum, quod sint veluti instrumenta quibus Dominus Jesus Christus nobis ea *distribuit*. . . . Necesse est igitur, nos in Cœna VERE *corpus* et *sanguinem* Christi recipere. . . . Itaque fatendum est . . . quemadmodum panis in manu distribuitur, ita *corpus Christi*, ut ejus participes simus, nobis communicari. . . . Intelligimus, Christum nobis in Cœna *veram propriamque. Corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam donare:* ut pleno jure ipsum possideamus,

et possidendo in omnem bonorum suorum societatem vocemur." (Calvin, "De Cœna Domini," in Works, vol. viii., p. 3; Amsterdam, 1667.)

(*b*) "Fatemur, Christum quod panis et vini symbolis figurat, vere præstare, ut animas nostras *carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potione* alat. . . . Neque enim dicimus quidquam ostendi quod non *vere detur.* Jubet nos Dominus panem et vinum accipere: interea spirituale *carnis suæ et sanguinis alimentum* se *dare* pronunciat." (Calvin's "Expositio" of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, in Works, vol. viii., p. 657.)

(*c*) "Nos *carnem* Christi et *sanguinem vere* nobis in Cœna *offerri* asserimus, ut animas nostras vivificent: nec ambigua est nostra definitio, non aliter hoc spirituali alimento, quod nobis in Cœna offertur, vegetari animas, quam corpora nostra pane terreno aluntur. *Vera* igitur *carnis et sanguinis Christi participatio* in Cœna a nobis statuitur. De voce *substantiæ* si quis litem moveat, Christum asserimus *a carnis suæ substantia* vitam in animas nostras spirare." (Calvin's "Secunda Defensio" against Westphal., in Works, vol. viii., p. 660.)

(*d*) "Non simpliciter dictum sit, Spiritus meus vere est cibus: sed *Caro mea:* nec simpliciter etiam dictum sit, Divinitas mea vere est potus: sed, *sanguis.* . . . Distincte affirmo, quam a vobis sumpsit *carnem, eam* nobis esse vivificam." (Calvin, "De verâ participatione," in Works, vol. viii., p. 726.)

(5) The ministers of Augsburg, declaring their matters of agreement with Luther, declare,—"Fatetur Lutherus . . . Duas res in Eucharistiâ *dari*, naturâ et essentiâ suâ distinctas, nempe *panem* et *corpus Domini, vinum* et *sanguinem Christi.* IDEM NOS QUOQUE FATEMUR. . . . Nobis enim anathema erunt, quicunque dicunt in Cœna Domini nudum panem et vinum offerri, neque fatentur, unicum et *verum donum* hîc esse, VERUM *corpus* et VERUM *sanguinem* Domini immo ipsum Dominum totum atque integrum, verum Deum et verum hominem." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," Part ii., 1533. Works, vol. iv., pp. 215, 216; Geneva, 1681.)

(6) Again:—The ministers of Augsburg declare—"*veram præsentiam et manducationem* in credentibus . . . *non minùs* plenè et perfectè *credimus et confitemur, quam Lutherus aut alius quispiam.*" (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," Part ii., 1533. Works, vol. iv., p. 218; Geneva, 1681.) And again:—"Simpliciter cum Scriptura loquimur, Dominum in Cœna *corpus* et *sanguinem suum* nobis *manducandum et bibendum dare.* Et ne quis fortè suspicetur, nos tantum imaginariam præsentiam et manducationem Christi in Eucharistiâ statuere, *vocabulum* VERE *apponimus.*" (Ibid. p. 218.)

(7) Œcolampadius declares,—"Bene et religiose loquntur, qui se dicunt accedere ad Corpus Domini, vel manducare corpus." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," Part ii., 1525. Works, vol. iv., p. 62; Geneva, 1681.)

(8) "Ne obscuretur vel extenuetur inæstimabile illud beneficium, in quo tota Cœnæ vis et efficacia consistit: nempe exhiberi nobis quod figuratur. Quod fieri non potest, nisi *recipiamus* illic *corpus* et *sanguinem* Domini, *non phantasia aut apprehensione mentis sed reipsa* ita

nobis *offerri*, ut vera substantialique unitate cum ipso cohæreamus." ("De Cœna Domini brevis admonitio" in Calvin's Works, vol. ix., p. 267; Amsterdam, 1667.)

(9) The *Syngramma Suevicum* asks in language approved then (1525) by Luther, and since by the Reformed, "Si remissio peccatorum *donum* nostrum est, cur non et *corpus* et *sanguis* per quæ nobis hæc remissio contingit, *dona* essent?" And it says, "Jam si *dona* sunt, consentaneum est, ut et pro ratione donorum distribuantur." And it teaches, "Non quispiam adventus est Christi, sicut initio carne venit, novissimo in gloria venturus, sed *doni* communicatio et distributio est." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," Part ii. in Works, vol. iv., p. 14; Geneva, 1681.)

(10) And Œcolampadius in his "Anti-syngramma" says, "Si *corpus* Christi et *sanguinem* dicitis *donari* pane et vino, Sicut Rex literis suis Regnum dat et includit, quo filium *donat* . . . solis verbis dissidemus." (Ibid. p. 102.) And again, "Cum dicitis, panem intrare in ventrem, *corpus* quod *creditur*, *intrare* in *animum* et *mentem*, nonne nobiscum sentitis?" (Ibid. p. 102.)

(11) "Quin Fideles *carne* et *sanguine* Christi *verè* et *substantialiter* in Cœna *alantur*, non nego, si tantum definiatur modus arcana Spiritus virtute fieri, ut vim suam caro et sanguis Christi in nos transfundant." (Calvin in Letter to Schalingius. See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1557, vol. iv., p. 425; Geneva, 1581.)

(12) "Non ullum sub elementis Cœnæ realiter delitescens corpus, aut sub vino sanguis, sed *unicum* duntaxat illud Christi *corpus* pro nobis in mortem *oblatum*, et ejus sanguis semel effusus, sunt *verus* animæ nostræ cibus et potus: quibus anima nostra *spiritualiter esuriens*, *spiritualiter pascitur*, dum *sacrificium illud corporis et sanguinis Christi* verâ et vivâ fide per Spiritum Sanctum apprehendit." (M. Micronius, Feb., 1554. See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1553. Part ii., p. 405; Geneva, 1581.)

(13) The ministers of Frankfort in 1553 replying to Luther's charges, declare their teaching to be that "*Verum* suum *corpus*, et *verum* suum *sanguinem verè* edendum, et bibendum, in cibum, potumque animarum, quo illæ in vitam æternam alantur, *dare* dignetur Dominus."

Again they declare "sic docere etiam sese, non dubitandum esse, quin Dominus *exhibeat* etiam *verum* et *substantiale corpus*, et *verum naturalem suum sanguinem in verum cibum* animarum nostrarum." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," part ii. in Works, vol. iv., p. 214; Geneva, 1681.)

(14) "Nos dicimus, ex Dei institutione, *corpus* quidem, panis illius traditione, ut *verum cibum: sanguinem* verò illius vini præbitione ut *verum potum* distinctè nobis mente ac fide, non ore, *sumenda dari*." ("Harmonia Confessionum," Observ. 5, in p. 145; Geneva, 1581.)

(15) "M. Atqui, nonne tunc se dedit, quum se exposuit in mortem, ut nos a mortis judicio redemptos Patri reconciliaret?

"P. Id quidem verum est: sed non satis est nobis, nisi eum *nunc recipiamus*: quo mortis ejus efficacia fructusque ad nos perveniat. . . .

"M. Quid ergo in symbolo panis habemus?

"P. *Corpus Christi,* ut semel pro nobis ad nos Deo reconciliandos immolatum fuit, ita *nunc* quoque nobis *dari:* ut certo sciamus, reconciliationem ad nos pertinere." (Calvin's Catechism, in Works, vol. viii., pp. 26, 27; Amsterdam, 1667.)

(16) "Quod autem *carnis suæ esu,* et *sanguinis potione,* quæ hic figurantur, Christus animas nostras per fidem, Spiritus Sancti virtute *pascit,* id non perinde accipiendum, quasi fiat aliqua substantialis vel commixtio, vel transfusio: sed quoniam ex *carne* semel in sacrificium *oblata,* et *sanguine* in expiationem *effuso,* vitam hauriamus." (Consensus Tigurinus, cap. xxiii.)

(17) "Ipsorum . . . fidem et doctrinam de hoc Sacramento hanc esse, quod sentiant, in eo ex institutione et opere Domini, verè (prout verba Christi sonant) *verum corpus et verum sanguinem suum* cum visibilibus signis, pane et vino, *exhiberi, dari* et sumi, et sic hoc ante hoc quoque tempus *non solum Zuinglium et Œcolampadium docuisse,* sed ipsos quoque in publicis Ecclesiarum Superioris Germaniæ Confessionibus, aliisque scriptis professos esse." (Bucer at Witeberg, 1536. See Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 243, a.)

(18) "Itaque præcipua hujus Sacramenti pars est *donum* Dei, nempe *corpus* et *sanguis Christi: Corpus,* inquam, illud quod pro nobis in mortem est *traditum:* et *sanguis* ille, qui in cruce *fusus* est, ad peccatorum nostrorum ablutionem. . . . Sic ergo *corpus* Christi *verè manducatur,* Sanguisque ejus *verè bibitur* in Cœna: non tamen crasso illo atque carnali modo . . . sed spiritualiter, id est, spirituali modo et fideli mente. . . . Neque negamus *corpus et sanguinem* Christi in sacra Cœna tanquam *verum* animæ *cibum percipi,* ac *manducari* in vitam æternam." (Letter of the Swiss to Luther concerning the *Concordia Witebergensis,* 1536, in Hospinian's Works, vol. iv., pp. 267, 268. See "Harm. Confess.," p. 113 sqq.)

(19) "Inde [Wernherus Bygelius] ad ministros Tigurinos conversus, *Creditisne vos,* inquit, *corpus et sanguinem Christi in Cœna percipi?* CREDIMUS HOC, aiebant omnes; nam singulos ordine compellebat." (Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 284.)

"Ibi corpus et sanguinem Domini et recipi et manducari . . . apertissime agnoscamus." (Letter of the Swiss to Luther, 1538, in Hospinian, vol. iv., p. 285.)

(20) The following words of Bucer (concerning whose views the reader will find something in a future Paper) may be aptly compared with the language cited above (p. 192, note) from Bishop Overall—"quod *Corpus* Christi *verè* et *substantialiter* a nobis *accipiatur,* cum Sacramento utimur. *Item,* quod panis et vinum sunt signa *exhibitiva, quibus datis et acceptis* simul *detur* et *accipiatur* Corpus Christi." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," 1535, in Works, vol. iv., p. 231; Geneva, 1581.)

While marking the similarity of Overall's language, the reader may also observe with what careful accuracy Overall has added "in recto usu sacramenti, digneque recipientibus." See also Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 126. P. S. Edit.

The following is also from Bucer, "Si quis vellet per 'adesse Dominum realiter et substantialiter' intelligere eum percipi *fide* reipsa et *substantiam* ejus, darem. Sin aliquid hujus sæculi vellet his vocibus admiscere, negarem. Reliquit enim Dominus mundum hunc. Voces 'carnaliter,' et 'naturaliter,' quoniam perceptionem sensuum innuunt, nunquam admiserim." ("Scripta Anglicana," quoted in Jenkyns's Cranmer, vol. iii., p. 55, note. See Strype's Cranmer, Appendix, xlvi.)

I will conclude this note with an extract from a modern writer, not of our communion (therefore, perhaps, less open to the charge of prejudice), but very competent to express an opinion on the subject he is writing on: "It is remarkable . . . that what may be styled the *high* sacramental doctrine, is not put forward with any special prominence in the teachings of this Church [the Church of England], as compared with the view held by the Reformed Church generally in the sixteenth century. . . .

"Though only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, as distinguished from a mere corporeal Eating, still 'the body of Christ is *given*, *taken* and Eaten in the Supper.' *Art.* xxviii. . . . Undoubtedly the doctrine of the *real presence* of Christ *by the Spirit*, in the Holy Eucharist, is plainly taught by the English Church; and it is only strange that any question should ever be made with regard to the point, in the Church itself. But it is no less certain, that it has no claim to be considered a distinctively Episcopal doctrine, so far at least as the past history of the Reformed Church is concerned, in any sense. Among all the early Reformed Confessions, there is hardly one in which it is not even more distinctly affirmed than it is in the Thirty-nine Articles. The Confession of the Reformed Dutch Church, in particular, is decidedly more high-toned here than the formulary of the Church of England; and we may say as much also even of the Westminster Confession itself." ("The Mystical Presence, a vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, by the Rev. J. W. Newin, D.D.," p. 98. Philadelphia, 1846.)

Note G, p. 224.

"We do *not* hold that we barely receive the *effects and benefits* of Christ's body; but we hold it *really present*, in as much as it is *really received*, and we actually *put in possession* of it though *locally absent* from us. So that while we spiritually eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood, we through faith, in a mysterious and ineffable manner, dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us; and by virtue of this spiritual and mystical yet real participation, we receive the benefits consequent to it; even the remission of our sins and all other benefits of Christ's Passion. This, *in short, is our meaning:* and *to this effect all true Church of England men declare it.*" (Dean Aldrich, quoted in "Goode on Eucharist," i., p. 40.)

"It is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Which expresses *communication* on the part of the donor, and *participation* on the side of the receiver. There is communication from God, and a participation by us, of Christ's *crucified* body directly, and of the body *glorified* consequentially. Yet this *grant* and this *reception* of our Lord's body are not to be understood with utmost rigour, but after the manner of *symbolical* grants and conveyances; where the *symbols* are construed to be in *real* and *beneficial* effect, what they supply the place of." (Waterland, vol. iv., p. 579.)

"The wax that is affixed to . . . letters patent, howsoever for substance it be the very same with that which is to be found everywhere, yet, being applied to this use, is of more worth to the patentee, than all the wax in the country beside: so standeth it with the outward elements in the matter of the sacrament . . . now they differ as much from common bread and wine, as heaven from earth. Neither are they to be accounted barely significative, but truly exhibitive also, of those heavenly things whereto they have relation: as being appointed by God to be a means of conveying the same unto us, and putting us in *actual* POSSESSION thereof. So that in the use of this holy ordinance, as verily as a man with his bodily hand and mouth receiveth the earthly creatures; *so verily doth he* with his spiritual hand and mouth, if any such he have, *receive the* BODY AND BLOOD *of Christ.*" (Archbishop Ussher's Sermon before Parliament, 1620. Works, vol. ii., p. 429.)

"A father makes his last will, and by it bequeaths his estate, and all the profits of it to his child. He delivers it into the hands of his son, and bids him take there his house and lands, which by this his last will he delivers to him. The son in this case receives nothing but a roll of parchment, with a seal tied to it from his father; but yet by virtue of this parchment he is entitled to his estate, performing the condition of his will, and to all the benefits and advantages of it: and in that deed he truly and effectually received the very house and lands that were thereby conveyed to him. Our Saviour Christ, in like manner, being now about to leave the world, gives this holy sacrament, as His final bequest to us; in it He conveys to us a right to His body and blood, and to all His spiritual blessings and graces that proceed from them. So that as often as we receive this holy Eucharist, as we ought to do, we receive indeed nothing but a little bread and wine into our hands; but by the blessing and promise of Christ, we, by that bread and wine, *as really and truly become* PARTAKERS OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD, as the son by the will of his father was made inheritor of his estate: nor is it *any more necessary* for this, that Christ's *body should come down* from heaven, or the outward elements which we receive, be substantially turned into it, than it is necessary in that other case, that the very house and lands should be given into the hands of the son to make a real delivery or conveyance of them; or the will of the father be truly and properly changed into the very nature and substance of them." (Archbishop Wake, in Gibson's Preservative; vol. x., pp. 85, 86.)

Compare the following from Dean Brevint :—"It is such an ordinary kind of figure, as all men commonly love to use in their most ordinary and clearest expressions. Thus, if a father will part his estate amongst his children, delivering into their hands the titles or deeds of what he gives, he says, 'My son, here is the land which my father left me; and this the house which I bought since,' etc. This way of speaking is both so plain, and so usual in all languages and countries, that it can drive none but distracted men to miracles and transubstantiation, for fear of any such figure." (Brevint's "Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass," p. 214; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

And this from Archbishop Tillotson :—"Nothing is more common in all languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the sign, as the delivery of a deed or writing under hand and seal is called a conveyance or making over of such an estate: and it is really so—not the delivery of mere wax and parchment . . . as truly and really to all effects and purposes of law, as if the very material houses and lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my hands. In like manner . . . by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to communicate or to be made partakers of the body of Christ which was broken, and of His blood which was shed for us; that is, of the real benefits of His death and passion." (Archbishop Tillotson's Works, vol. i., p. 300; Edit. 1710.)

Hutchinson says :—"Thy house and garden be not locally, not really, nor corporally, in thy lease; but effectually and sufficiently for thy profit and commodity. So Christ's body and blood be in bread and wine. This is no new similitude of mine own head: it is the similitude of Gregory Nazianzen. . . . St. Austin, also, . . . calleth them *sacrosancta signacula*." (Hutchinson's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 252.)

The following is from the work of Bertram which led Ridley to the true view of the Eucharist. "We know that it is only in *some particular manner* the body of Christ; which manner is *figurative*, and in the way of *an image;* so that the verity is the thing itself. In the prayers used after the mystery of Christ's body and blood, to which the people say, *Amen;* the Priest speaks thus, 'we who have now received the *pledge* of eternal life, most humbly beseech thee to grant, that we may be manifestly made partakers of that which here we receive *under an image or sacrament*.' A *pledge and image* are the pledge and image of somewhat else; that is, they do not respect themselves, but another thing. It is *the pledge* of that thing for which it is given, *the image* of the thing it represents. They *signify* the things of which they are the pledge or image, but are not the very thing itself." (Bertram or Rathram, "Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," pp. 199, 200. Edit. Dublin, 1753.)

Note H, p. 225.

The Rubric for the Communion of the Sick says :—

"If a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want

of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacraments with his mouth."

"In the Anglican Sarum and York *Pre-Reformation* Manuals, there was the peculiarity, as compared with the continental, of an exceptional proviso, somewhat similar to the above *primâ facie*. When in danger of vomiting the patient was told, '*Tantum crede, et Manducasti.*' But . . . the *faith* required was totally different, being faith, not in Jesus Christ personally, but in the fact of the consecrated elements being by transubstantiation truly Christ." (E. B. Elliott's "Reply to the Charge of the late Bishop of Salisbury," p. 30. On the subject of this teaching in the Sarum Manual, see Pusey, "Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," pp. 225-227; and "Goode on Eucharist," vol. ii., p. 621.)

[Mr. Elliott's interpretation is supported by the context immediately preceding. The entire passage is as follows: "*Postea interroget eum Sacerdos si recognoscat corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi sic dicendo.* Frater, credis quod sacramentum, quod tractatur in altare sub forma panis, est verum corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi? *Respondeat infirmus.* Credo. *Deinde communicetur infirmus nisi prius communicatus fuerit: et nisi de vomitu vel alia irreverentia probabiliter timeatur: in quo casu dicat sacerdos infirmo.* Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides, et bona voluntas: tantum crede, et manducasti." (In Maskell's "Monumenta Ritualia," vol. i., pp. 88, 89.)

The difference of the teaching of our present rubric is sufficiently striking. But I suppose it will hardly be maintained that the "*vera fides*" here spoken of must needs have relation to this particular *alone*.

It is observable, however, that Bishop Cosin understands the words of St. Augustine here used—"Crede tantum et manducasti"—and so often applied by our Reformers in support of the doctrine which our present rubric teaches, as having reference to the same *particular* of doctrine. His words are—"The faith whereby we are said to eat the flesh of Christ is not that only whereby we believe that He died for our sins, (for this faith is required and supposed to precede the sacramental manducation,) but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, 'This is my body,'—which was St. Austin's meaning when he said, 'Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? Believe, and thou hast eaten.'" ("History of Transubstantiation," ch. iii., § 3; Works, Edit. Oxford, vol. iv., p. 171.) Our Reformers understood St. Augustin's words differently; and *their*

sense of them they considered to be clearly supported by other teaching of St. Augustin. (See *e.g.*, Cranmer on Lord's Supper, pp. 115, 118, 208, 212, 232; Jewel, Harding, Thess., etc., pp. 776, 1119; Sermon and Harding, p. 468; Apol. and Defence, p. 486; etc., etc.)]

Very many passages from the writings of the Reformers might be quoted, which teach in like manner (the "Crede and Manducasti" of St. Augustine) that we receive, and eat and drink Christ's body and blood whensoever (with or without the receipt of the sacramental signs) we believe with living faith that Christ's body was crucified and His blood was shed for us.

Thus, in his earlier writings, even Luther himself taught—"Carnem Filii Dei manducare, et sanguinem bibere, nihil aliud est, quam ut credam, carnem ipsius pro me datam, et sanguinem pro me effusum esse; et ideo spiritualem hanc manducationem esse oportet." (See Hospinian, "Historia Sacramentaria," Part ii., in Works, vol. iv., p. 12; Geneva, 1681.)

Thus Tyndale:—

"God sent His Son into this world that we might live through Him. Who liveth by Him? They that eat His flesh and drink His blood. Who eat His flesh and drink His blood? They that *believe His body crucified and His blood shed* FOR THEIR SINS." (Answer to More, etc. P. S. Edit., p. 224.)

Again:—"Here it is to be noted diligently, that Christ meaneth, as every man may see, by the *eating of this bread*, none other thing than the *belief in Himself offered up for our sins*, which faith only justifieth us." (Ibid. p. 226.)

Again:—"Thus we there have Christ present, in the inward eye and sight of our faith. We *eat His body and drink* His blood; *that is*, we *believe* surely that *His body was crucified for our sins*, and *His blood shed for our salvation.*" (Ibid. p. 236.)

Again (interpreting the words of our Lord):—"My flesh profiteth you nothing to eat it; but to believe that it shall be crucified and suffer for the redemption of the world, it profiteth. And when ye *thus believe*, then eat ye my flesh and drink my blood; that is, ye believe in me, to suffer for your sins." (Ibid. p. 239.)

Thus Cranmer:—"The true *eating and drinking* of the said *body and blood* of *Christ* is, with a constant and lively faith to *believe*, that Christ gave His body, and shed His blood upon the cross for us." (On the Lord's Supper, p. 43.)

"These things . . . are sufficient to prove, that the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood . . . is a figurative speech, spiritually to be understood, that we must deeply print and fruitfully believe in our hearts, that His flesh was crucified and His blood shed for our redemption. And *this our belief* in Him *is to eat His flesh and drink His blood*, although they be not present here with us." (Ibid. p. 115.)

Again he affirms that St. Augustin saith, "That to eat Christ's flesh, and to drink His blood, is a figurative speech, signifying the participation of His passion, and the delectable remembrance, to our

benefit and profit, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us." (Ibid. p. 212.)

Again, defending his position against Gardiner, he says :—

"I say not that in the Lord's Supper is but a figure, or that Christ is eaten only figuratively. . . . And where you understand the invisible mystery, which St. Augustine speaketh of to be *the diversity of the body of Christ*, seen or not seen, you be far deceived. . . . But to *eat Christ's flesh*, saith St. Augustine, is *fruitfully to remember* that the same *flesh was crucified for* us. And this is spiritually to *eat His flesh and drink His blood*." (Ibid. p. 232.)

So Ridley :—"Neither is the same [flesh] received in the Supper only, but also at other times, by hearing the Gospel, and *by faith*." (Works, p. 222.)

And again :—"You do allege . . . inferring hereupon that Christ never gave the same His flesh to be eaten, but only in the Eucharist : I deny your minor : for He gave it both in the Eucharist to be eaten, and also otherwise, as well *in the word*, as also upon the cross." (Ibid. p. 234.)

So Latimer :—

"Whosoever *believeth* in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and confidence in Him, *he eateth and drinketh* Him, for the spiritual eating is the right eating to everlasting life." (Sermons, pp. 458, 459.)

So Hooper :—

"We must therefore lift up our minds into heaven, when we feel ourselves oppressed with the burden of sin, and there by *faith apprehend* and *receive* the body of Christ slain and killed, and His precious blood shed, *for our offences ;* and so, by *faith*, apply the virtue, efficacy, and strength of the merits of Christ to our souls, and by that means quit ourselves from the danger, damnation, and curse of God. And *thus to be partaker* of the worthiness and deservings of Christ's passion, *is to eat the body and drink the blood*." (Early Writings, p. 530.)

So Hutchinson :—

"To *eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood*, is to *believe* that the Son of God, concerning His humanity and flesh, was *nailed on the cross*, and that *His blood was let forth* for the expiation of *our sins*, and for our redemption and righteousness. . . . God's holy word knoweth no other receipt of Christ's very body and natural flesh, neither in the Sacrament nor without it." (Works, pp. 262, 263.)

So Coverdale :—

"Then *eat we His flesh, and then drink we His blood*, when we, through *true belief*, do ponder and *consider* what He hath done and *suffered for our sakes*." ("Fruitful Lessons," P. S. Edit., p. 212.)

So Jewel, who had before ("Apology and Defence," p. 487) quoted from St. Augustine the same passage, the true meaning of which Cranmer was defending, says :—

"Christ . . . meant not the receiving of the Sacrament, but the spiritual *eating of His very body*, and the spiritual *drinking of His very blood ;* whereof he is made partaker unto resurrection and

life everlasting, *whosoever believeth in the death of Christ.* ("Apology and Defence," p. 532.)

So Becon:—

"What is it to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ? It is to believe that Christ suffered His passion for our sins." (Prayers, etc., p. 612.)

So Sandys:—

"Spiritually by faith we *feed upon Christ,* when we steadfastly *believe that His body was broken, and His blood shed for* us, upon the cross." (Sermons, p. 89.)

To prevent misunderstanding it may be well perhaps to admonish the reader, that he would do very wrong to gather from these extracts that our Reformers thought that it was a matter of indifference to receive or not receive the outward and visible signs. They did *not* hold that Christ's ordinance might be neglected by Christians. They *did* hold and teach the general necessity of the Sacrament unto salvation.

Note I, p. 226.

Thus it is said by Bertram:—"In this sacrifice, there is a thanksgiving, and commemoration of that flesh of Christ, which He offered for us, and of that blood, which the same [Christ] our God, hath shed for us." (Bertram or Rathram, "Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," p. 204. Edit. Dublin, 1753.) Again, "The bread and cup, which is called, and is the body and blood of Christ, represents the memory of the Lord's passion or death . . . is set there for a figure, or in remembrance of the Lord's death." (Ibid. p. 211.)

[Compare the following:—

"Fractio hostiæ imaginem refert corporis Christi confracti et suppliciis lacerati, ut veteres omnes agnoscunt." (Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, Tom. i., Dissertatio, p. xx. Frankfort, 1847.)

"Dum enim, sicut ait Prosper, frangitur hostia et sanguis in ora fidelium infunditur, immolatio corporis Christi in cruce, et effusio sanguinis ejus de latere designatur." (Durandus, Rationale Div. offic., p. 302. Naples, 1859.)]

So Cranmer:—"By whose passion we are filled at His table, and whose blood, we, receiving out of His holy side, do live for ever . . . being no less assured and certified, that we are fed spiritually unto eternal life by Christ's flesh crucified, and by His blood shed, the true food of our minds, than our bodies be fed with meat and drink in this life." (Cranmer in Foxe's Acts and Monuments, vol. vi., p. 448.)

"As though he [Christ] should say . . . 'Consider and behold my body crucified for you: *that* eat and digest in your minds; chew you upon my *passion,* be fed with my *death.* This is the true meat." (Ibid. p. 448.)

And so Bradford:—"I have told you that it is not simply bread and wine, but rather Christ's body, so called of Christ, and so to be

called and esteemed of us. But here let us mark what body and what blood Christ called it. The papists still babble 'This,' 'this is my body, this is my blood;' but what body it is, what blood it is, they shew not. Look therefore . . . on Christ's own words; and you shall see that Christ calleth it 'His body broken' and 'His blood shed' . . . so that in the celebration of the Lord's Supper the *very passion* of Christ should be *as present*, beholden with the eyes of faith." (Bradford, Sermons, Meditations, etc. P. S. Edit., p. 102.)

See Nowell's Catechism :—" M. Then I perceive the Holy Supper *sendeth us* TO THE DEATH OF CHRIST, and to His sacrifice *once done upon the Cross*, by which alone God is appeased towards us. S. It is most true. For by bread and wine, the signs, is assured unto us, that as the body of Christ was once offered a sacrifice for us to reconcile us to favour with God, and His blood once shed, to wash away the spots of our sins, so now also in His Holy Supper BOTH ARE GIVEN TO THE FAITHFUL, that we *surely know that the reconciliation of favour* pertaineth to us, and may *take and receive* the fruit of the redemption purchased by His death." (P. S. Edit., p. 215.)

And so Hooker :—

" The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching EFFICACY, FORCE, AND VIRTUE, even the BLOOD OF HIS GORED SIDE; in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, OUR HUNGER IS SATISFIED, and OUR THIRST *for ever* QUENCHED." (Hooker, Keble Edit., vol. ii., p. 361.)

So Bishop Andrewes, " We are also carried back to Christ, as HE WAS at the VERY INSTANT, and in the VERY ACT *of His* OFFERING. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach; so, and no otherwise, do we represent Him." Upon which passage Archbishop Wake has written, " Whatever Real Presence this bishop believed, it must be of His CRUCIFIED BODY, and as in the state of His DEATH; and that I think cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Archbishop Cranmer, and both of which we willingly acknowledge; either figuratively in the elements, or spiritually in *the souls of those who worthily receive them.*" (See Archbishop Wake, " Discourse of the Holy Eucharist," in Gibson's Preservative. Vol. x., pp. 69, 70.)

So Dr. Barlow :—

" Great difference there is (perchance not observed by many) between our *eating* of Christ, and our *uniting* with Him.

" 1. We *eat* Him as our Passover; that as the Israelites ate the one *mortuum et assum, dead and roasted*, so we Him *crucifixum et passum, dead and slain.* And so that speech of St. Austin is true. We have Him here *in pabulo* as He was *in patibulo*, torn and rent: as Himself ordained the Sacrament *in pane fracto* not *integro*, the *bread broken*, not the *whole loaf*; thereby signifying, yea saying, that in doing it we must remember Him, not as *living* among us, but as *dying* for us : *ut in cruce, non in cælo*, as He was *crucified*, not as He

is *glorified*. Whereby we conclude, first, for His *presence*, that His body is so far forth there *quatenus editur*, as it is *eaten;* but His body is *eaten* as *dead and slain;* so Himself appointed it, *this is my body*, and stayeth not there, but adds withal, *which is given for you*. And His blood is drunk, not as *remaining in His veins*, but as *shed;* so Himself speaketh, *This is my blood of the New Testament* SHED *for many*. Now, His body bruised, and His blood *poured out*, can no otherwise be *present* in the Eucharist, but by a *representation* thereof in the bread *broken*, and in the wine *effused*, of the one side; and on the communicant's part, by a grateful *recordation* of the benefits, a reverent *valuation* of the sacrifice, a faithful *application* of His merits in His whole passion: and therefore His *presence* must be *sacramental*, and our eating spiritual; for *non quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit*, saith St. Austin. 2. For the *union*, we are united to Him *ut viventi*, as our *living* head, *et nos vivificanti*, and making us His lively members." (Dr. Barlow, quoted in Waterland, iv., pp. 603, 604.)

So Bishop Lake:—

"This will not only secure our souls, but settle our judgments against the sophistry of the Church of Rome, who *not distinguishing between Christ crucified and glorified*, or rather not building their conclusions answerable to this undeniable principle, THE SACRAMENTS REPRESENT CHRIST CRUCIFIED, NOT GLORIFIED, are driven to coin so many new Articles. 1. Of *Real Presence Corporal*. 2. Of a metaphysical transubstantiation. 3. Of an ill-applied concomitancy. All which *easily vanish*, if we consider Christ's *purpose to represent Himself* in the Sacrament, not as HE NOW IS AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, BUT AS HE WAS UPON THE CROSS. Not but it is the *same* body and blood which is in glory, but it must not be considered as it is in glory." (Bishop Lake, Sermons, Part ii., p. 170, 1629.)

Bishop Hall says of the words "This is my body which is given for you"—"This was the body which was given for them, betrayed, crucified, humbled to the death; not the glorious body of Christ, which should be capable of ten thousand places at once, both in heaven and earth; invisible, incircumscriptable." (Works, vol. ix., p. 253. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

So Bishop Reynolds:—

"It hath pleased our good God . . . to exhibit with His own hands (for, what is done by His officers is by Him done) that sacred body, with the efficacy of it, unto us . . . that we might, at this spiritual altar, see Christ (as it were) crucified before our eyes, cling unto His cross, and grasp it in our arms, suck in His blood, and with salvation . . . that being all over dyed with His blood, we may use boldness." (Works, vol. iii., pp. 83, 84. Edit. 1826.)

So Bishop Patrick, "How doth He communicate to us His Incarnation, but by giving us the fruits and benefits of it? And so He communicates to us His *broken* body, and His blood that was *shed*. We partake of both in the same manner. . . . By means of this Sacrament we are INVESTED IN THE MERIT *of them*. For it is NOT *merely* His body and blood, but His body *broken* and blood *shed* (as I

said just now,) which we are made partakers of. And that is as much as to say, we are partakers of His death." (Christian Sacrifice, Part ii., § vi., p. 54. Edit. 1690.)

So Brevint:—

"Jesus living in Galilee . . . could not have been the bread of life: it must be Jesus *suffering*, Jesus *crucified*, Jesus *dying*." (Brevint's "Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," p. 24; Edit. Oxford, 1673.)

So Dr. Waterland writes:—

"The Eucharist, in its primary intention, and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants, is a communion of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is to say, a present partaking of, or having a part in our Lord's Passion, and the reconcilement therein made, and the blessed fruits of it. This is plain good sense, and undeniable truth. 'The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received of the faithful: that is, they have a real part and portion given them in the death and sufferings of the Lord Jesus, whose body was broken and blood shed for the remission of sins. They truly and indeed partake of the virtue of His bloody sacrifice, whereby He hath obtained eternal redemption for us.' (Patrick.) It is observable, that St. Paul, (his own best interpreter,) instead of saying, Ye do shew the Lord's body and blood, broken and shed, says, 'Ye do shew the Lord's death till He come.' Which makes it plain, that *body broken and blood shed* are, in this case, equivalent to the single word *death* with its *fruits;* and that is the *thing signified* in our sacramental service. And if that be the thing signified, it is that which we partake of, or spiritually receive: and we are in this Sacrament ingrafted, as it were, into the death of Christ, in much the same sense, and to the same effect, as in the other sacrament we are said to be baptized into His death, and planted together in the likeness of His death. All the difference is, that the same thing is represented and exhibited, here and there, under different signs or symbols. There we have our right and title to the merits and benefits of His passion, delivered to us under the symbol of water enclosing us, as a grave encloses a dead body; here we have the same right and title again delivered under the symbols of bread and wine, received by us, and incorporated with us." (Waterland, Works, vol. iv., pp. 620, 621.)

And again:—

"We say, upon our principles, that the distinct mentioning both of the body and the blood was exceeding proper, and very significant; because it shews that our Lord is considered in the Eucharist according to the state He was in at His crucifixion: for then only it was, that His body and blood were separate; one hanging on the Cross, the other spilled upon the ground. That body and that blood are commemorated in the Eucharist, the body broken and the blood shed; therefore, St. Paul so distinctly mentioned both, lest Christians should think (as indeed, in late and dark ages, Christians have thought,) that the words of the institution, though express for broken

body, and blood shed upon earth, should be interpreted to mean His glorified body in heaven. St. Paul very justly followed the style of the institution, our Lord's own style : and by that he shewed, that he was speaking of the separation of the body and blood, which in reality was the death of our Lord, or seen only in His death, and consequently such manner of speaking directly pointed to the death of our Lord, and to the fruits or benefits arising from it." (Waterland, Works, vol. iv., pp. 636, 637.)

Mr. S. C. Malan writes :—

"We, therefore, require no special rite to remind us of Him who is present, and who, if we live with Him as we ought, is 'the Friend who sticketh closer than a brother'; not once only but always. But we do require something to remind us of His death and sacrifice; and some special act, rite, or ceremony to be done *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* for the purpose of helping our minds and hearts to turn back to that one oblation, which could only be wrought once, and which was then once offered for ever. As regards, then, the intention and performance of the holy rite itself, it has regard *to that sacrifice* ONLY. . . . The Sacrament was instituted in remembrance of Him AS HE WAS *at the time of His death and passion* ONLY, says S. Chrysostom." (Malan's "Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," Nutt, p. 93. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 67, 68, and 36, 37.)

"The body and blood are exhibited by the bread and wine in a state of separation from one another. Now the blood is in Scripture said to be the Life; and accordingly the separation of the blood from the body indicates that death has taken place. It is, then, with a dying Christ, and so with an atoning and propitiating Christ, that the Holy Supper, duly received, makes us one." (Goulburn on Office of Holy Communion, p. 307.)

Note K, p. 228.

Dean Goode has excellently said, "When our Church denied the corporal presence, the presence of the real body and blood, it indirectly maintained, in so doing, the figurative sense of the words *eating* and *drinking*, because it *is* of the *true real material body and blood of Christ* that we are to eat and drink." And again :—"The real material body and blood of Christ may be made present to the *spirit* of man, as the sun is present when seen and felt, and be spiritually fed upon through faith. And as to any marcionite phantasm of the body and blood of Christ, such as our authors imagine, *this is not what the believer wants.* HIS FAITH WANTS THE REALITY TO FEED UPON; the true material body and blood; the body that was broken and the blood that was shed upon the cross." (On Eucharist, vol. i., pp. 53, 54.)

Let the reader be asked to study, in this connexion, the two following extracts from Bertram :—

"How warily, and wisely doth he [St. Ambrose] distinguish; speaking of the flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried, or in

which Christ was crucified and buried, he saith, It is the true flesh of Christ: But of that which is taken in the sacrament he saith, It's therefore truly the sacrament of His flesh, distinguishing between the sacrament of His flesh and the verity of His flesh, [or His true flesh] inasmuch as he saith, in that true flesh which He took of the Virgin, He was crucified and buried; whereas he saith, the mystery celebrated in the Church is the sacrament of that true flesh in which He was crucified: expressly teaching the faithful, that that flesh, in which Christ was crucified and buried, is not a mystery, but true and natural; whereas that flesh which mystically represents the former, is not flesh in kind, or naturally, but sacramentally." (Bertram or Rathram, "Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus," pp. 181, 182; Edit. Dublin, 1753.)

"It . . . confers eternal life and incorruption, if we attend not to that which feeds the body, which is chewed with our teeth, and ground to pieces, but to that which is spiritually received by faith." (Ibid. p. 202.)

"That flesh which was crucified, was made of the virgin's flesh, consisting of bones and nerves. . . . Moreover the flesh of Christ, which was crucified, did not outwardly appear any other thing, than what inwardly it was. For it was the true flesh of a true man; a true body in the shape of a true body." (Ibid. pp. 190, 191.)

"That which our bodily sense perceives is corruptible; that which faith believes, is incorruptible. Wherefore that which outwardly appears, is not the thing itself, but the image of it; but that which the mind perceives and understands, is the very thing itself." (Ibid. p. 194. See also the passages quoted in pp. 410 and 415.)

[No doubt there are passages in Bertram's work which require a favourable construction,—some, which in his *figurative* language, might appear to speak of another *not real* body. But other passages seem to me to give the key to their true interpretation. (See especially pp. 143, 145, 147, 180, 191, 197, 204, 205.) And the reader who has marked the force of his teaching in the extracts given above, will scarcely, I think, so much wonder that a Romish Divine should have believed the book to be written by Œcolampadius in Bertram's name (see L'Aroque, "History of Eucharist," Walker's Translation, 1684, p. 406, sqq., and Mosheim's "Eccl. History," vol. ii., p. 199, See also p. 220. Edit. Soames) as that Bertram should now be claimed as a teacher (to our Reformers) of the Real Objective Presence (see Pusey's "Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church," p. 205, sqq.). If Bertram believed a Real Objective Presence to be in the bread and wine, he believed the same to have been in the manna and the rock (pp. 160 and 162). Nay, it seems to me quite clear that he teaches that *the faithful people* are present in the elements with the *very same presence* as the body of Christ, (pp. 191, 192, 210,) *i.e.* in a *mystery* or in *a figure*. To the Dublin Edition is prefixed a Dissertation which ably vindicates Bertram from misrepresentation. (See pp. 74-139, and especially pp. 84, 100, 103, 106.)]

Let the reader also be asked to note well what Jewel says:—"Christ . . . meant . . . the *spiritual eating* of His VERY BODY, and the *spiritual drinking* of His VERY BLOOD; whereof *he* is *made partaker* unto resurrection and life everlasting, whosoever believeth in the death of Christ." (Apology and Defence, p. 532.) And to the same effect Beza:—"Certainly it would be too absurd to interpret the names of the body and blood as the fruit and efficacy of the death of the Lord, or to restrain them to the spiritual object thereof alone. To make this perfectly plain, let us substitute that interpretation for these words, 'body' and 'blood,' and say, 'This is the efficacy of my death, which is given for you; and this is my Spirit, which is poured out for you.' What more senseless than such a mode of speaking? For certainly those words 'which is given for you,' of necessity constrain men to understand it *of the very substance* of the body and blood of Christ." (Quoted in Dr. Pusey's Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," p. 32. See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 59, sqq.)

So Cranmer:—

"And to express it yet more plainly than peradventure you would have me, I say, that the SAME VISIBLE AND PALPABLE FLESH that was for us *crucified and appeared* after His resurrection, and was *seen, felt*, and *groped*, and *ascended* into heaven, and there *sitteth* at His Father's right hand, and at the last day shall come to judge the quick and the dead; THAT SELF SAME BODY, *having all the parts of a man's body*, in good order and proportion, and being visible and tangible, I say, is eaten of Christian people at His Holy Supper. What will you now require more of me concerning the truth of the body? I suppose you be sorry that I grant you so much, and yet what doth this help you? FOR THE DIVERSITY IS NOT IN THE BODY, but in THE EATING thereof, *no man eating it carnally*; but the good eating it both sacramentally and spiritually, and the evil only sacramentally, that is to say, figuratively." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 224.)

And again:—

"And yet here is to be noted by the way, that you say we receive not in the Sacrament Christ's flesh that was crucified; which your words seem to agree evil with Christ's words, who, the night before He was crucified, declared to His disciples, that He gave them the same body that should suffer death for them. And the apostles received the body of Christ, yet passible and mortal, which the next day was crucified; and if we receive not in the Sacrament the body that was crucified, then receive we not the same body that the apostles did." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 234.)

Compare the following:—

"*Weston.* 'The same flesh whereby Christ is made our brother and kinsman, is given of Christ to us to be eaten. Christ is made our brother and kinsman by His true, natural, and organical flesh. Ergo, His true, natural, organical flesh is given to us to be eaten.'

"*Cranmer.* '*I* GRANT *the consequence and the consequent.*'" (Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," vol. vi., p. 451.)

[It must not be said that there is any inconsistency between such sayings of Cranmer, and his declaration (in Preface to Edit. 1551) that when he speaks of the presence of the body he means the real and effectual presence of "the grace, the virtue and benefit" of Christ's body crucified and blood shed. On the contrary, in the harmony of such statements is evidence of Cranmer's true view (and the same may be said of our other Reformers) of the inseparable connexion between the *real presence* of the benefits and the *real giving and receiving* of the crucified body itself—not present save to the eye of faith.]

So Archbishop Ussher :—

"We willingly indeed do acknowledge, that that which is inwardly presented in the Lord's Supper, and spiritually received by the soul of the faithful, IS THAT VERY THING which is treated of in the sixth of John ; but we deny that it was our Saviour's intention in this place to speak of that which is externally delivered in the Sacrament and orally received by the communicant." (Archbishop Ussher's Answer to Jesuits' Challenge ; in Works ; vol. iii., p. 54. See Bishop Parry's True Passover, pp. 64, 65.)

Note L, p. 230.

See Archbishop Sharp, as quoted in Waterland's Works, vol. iv., p. 569. "The *body* and *blood* of Christ are to be understood in such a sense as a *soul* can be supposed to feed upon a *body*, or to receive strength and nourishment by *feeding* upon it. But now the body of Christ CAN BE *no otherwise* as *food* for the strengthening and refreshing our souls, than only as the *spiritual benefits* of that body and blood, that is to say, *the virtue and effects of Christ's sacrifice* upon the Cross, are communicated to it ; nor is the soul capable of receiving those benefits otherwise than by *faith*."

So Ridley :—"This virtue and grace Chrysostom, after the phrase and manner of John the Evangelist, calleth Christ's flesh." (Works, p. 224.)

So Jewel writes, "St. Augustine saith : *Laverunt stolas suas in sanguine Agni, . . . hoc est, in gratia Dei . . . per Christum :* 'They have washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb, that is to say, in the grace of God through Christ.' This grace flowing from Christ's body upon the Cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration of the holy mysteries, oftentimes *beareth the name of Christ's body*, and is the ground and substance of the Sacrament ; and whosoever is *partaker of this grace* is also *partaker of Christ's body*." (Apol. and Defence, p. 487.)

So Bishop Morton :—

"The TRUTH of a thing consisteth *especially* in the EFFECTUAL VIRTUE which it hath. . . . Vain is that vulgar conceit of some, who ask how can a man eat the body of Christ spiritually ? when as indeed they should rather demand, how shall a man eat the body of Christ *truly* (according to the principal truth wherein we are com-

manded to eat it,) except it be spiritually?" (Morton's Catholic Appeal. Lib. ii., cap. 2, sect. 26, pp. 117, 128.)

Compare the following from Dean Jackson:—"Unless He grant some *real influence* of His Spirit . . . we do *not* REALLY receive His body and blood with the elements of bread and wine; we do not so receive them as to have our sins remitted or dissolved by them; we do not by receiving them become of His flesh and of His bones; we gain no degree of real union with Him; which is the sole *use or fruit* of His *real presence*. Christ *might be* LOCALLY *present*, as He was with many here on earth, and yet *not* REALLY *present*. But with whomsoever He is virtually present—that is, to whomsoever He communicates the *influence* of His body and blood by His Spirit—He is REALLY *present* with them, though LOCALLY *absent* from them." (Dean Jackson's Works, vol. ix., p. 611; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

And add the following:—"The implication contained in the connexion between these two verses [John vi. 62, 63] and the precedent is this—That Christ's virtual presence, or the influence of life, which His human nature was to distil from His heavenly throne, should be more profitable to such as were capable of it, than His bodily presence, than the bodily eating of His flesh and blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating His very flesh and drinking His very blood in the Sacrament." (Ibid. vol. x., p. 41; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

And the following:—"If, by the mere virtual presence of Christ's body and blood, the men which have been long dead shall be restored to perfect life and immortality, shall not the souls of all which receive Him in the Sacrament by faith and true repentance be raised to newness of life by the same virtual presence, without any *local touch* of His body, but only by that sweet influence which daily issueth from this Sun of righteousness, now placed at the right hand of God as in its proper sphere. This manner of Christ's presence, of His real presence in the Sacrament—to wit, by *powerful influence from His humanity*—our Church did never deny." (Ibid. vol. x., p. 261; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

Dean Jackson says also:—"This *present efficacy* of Christ's body and blood upon our souls, or *real communication* of both, I find as a truth unquestionable amongst the ancient fathers, and as a Catholic Confession. The modern Lutheran and the modern Romanist have fallen into their several errors concerning Christ's presence in the Sacrament, from a common ignorance; neither of them conceive, or are willing to conceive, how Christ's body and blood should have any real operation upon our souls, unless they were so *locally present*, as they might *agere per contactum;* that is, either so purge our souls by oral manducation, as physical medicines do our bodies, (which is the pretended use of transubstantiation,) or so quicken our souls, as sweet odours do our animal spirits, which were the most probable use of

consubstantiation. Both the Lutherans and Papists avouch the authority of the ancient Church for their opinions, but most injuriously." (Ibid. vol. ix., p. 598; Edit. Oxford, 1844.)

So Hammond:—"So verily God is in Heaven, bestows on me, communicates to me, the body of the crucified Saviour," . . . [above], "On His part, the making over to us *all the benefits* of His body and blood (*i.e.* His death), grace and pardon, to sanctify and to justify us." (Practical Catechism, p. 129. See also p. 180.)

And again:—

"What was before said in Christ's words to be His *body*, is more manifestly said, [by St. Paul] to be the *communication of* His *body*, that is, the bestowing it upon us, (as the communication of the altar, among the Jews or Gentiles, is their eating of the sacrifice, their Gods entertaining them at that sacrificial feast,) which, I suppose, concludes this sacrament to be, according to the nature of sacraments, a holy rite, a *solemn act or instrument*, instituted by God to communicate to or confer on us *the body of Christ, that is*, the EFFICACY and BENEFITS *of Christ's* DEATH." (On Matt. xxvi. 26.)

Bishop Hall says:—"So doth our mouth and stomach receive the bread and wine, as that in the meantime our souls receive the flesh and blood of Christ: now the soul is *not capable* of receiving flesh and blood, but by the power of that grace of *faith, which appropriates it*." (Works, vol. ix., pp. 371, 372. Edit. Pratt, 1808.)

Bishop Reynolds says:—"A true presence of Christ we acknowledge, but not a local or physical; for presence real (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance. . . . What presence fitter for a spiritual union than a spiritual presence? . . . It is a spiritual presence, of energy, power, and concomitancy with the element, by which Christ doth appoint, that *by* and *with* these mysteries, though not *in* or *from* them, his *sacred body* should be conveyed into the faithful soul. And such a presence of Christ *in power*, though absent in flesh, as it is most compatible with the properties of a human body, so doth it most make for the demonstration of his power, who can, without any necessity of a fleshly presence, send as *great influence* from his sacred body on the Church, as if he should visibly descend amongst us. Neither can any man show any enforcing reason, why, unto the real exhibition and reception of Christ crucified, there should any more physical presence of his be required, than there is of the sun unto the eyes for receiving his light . . . or of the land and purchase made over by a sealed deed for receiving the lordship." (Works, vol. iii., pp. 72, 73, 74. Edit. 1826.)

So Brevint:—"Faithful communicants eat as effectually of the body of Jesus Christ, by receiving its STRENGTH *and virtue*, as the saints eat of the tree of life (Rev. xxii. 2) because they did eat of the *fruit* of that tree: or Israel did drink of the rock (1 Cor. x. 4) because they did drink of the stream that flowed from it. . . . The truth is, we really touch, have, or enjoy, the thing itself, when we are within that distance where we may enjoy its *virtue*. . . . Thus Christ's

body and blood have everywhere, but especially at the holy communion, a most *true and real presence.* . . . Since he is gone up into heaven, thence he sends down on earth the *graces* that spring continually from his everlasting sacrifice . . . this sacred body of Jesus fills with *atonement* and *blessing* the remotest parts of this temple." (Brevint's "Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," pp. 47-49.)

Compare Archbishop Sharp:—"Though his body be in heaven, and not here, yet he is, by his Spirit, *really present* in and with all those who do worthily partake of his sacrament, in order to the strengthening and refreshing their souls by *his influence,* as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the bread and wine. And this is *all that we mean* by the *real presence* in the sacrament." (Archbishop Sharp's Works. Edit. Oxford, 1829, vol. v., p. 228.)

So Archbishop Secker:—"We acknowledge, that the bread and wine are more than a representation of his body and blood: they are the means, by which the *benefits,* arising from them, are conveyed to us; and have thence a further title to be called by their name. For so the Instrument, by which a Prince forgives an offender, is called his Pardon, because it conveys his Pardon; the delivery of a writing is called giving Possession of an Estate; and a Security for a sum of money, is called the Sum itself; and *is so in virtue and effect,* though it is not in strictness of speech, and reality of substance. . . . And as this is plainly the sense, in which he [Christ] says, that *his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed:* so it is the sense, in which the latter part of the third answer of our Catechism is to be understood; that *the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.*" (Lectures on the Catechism, vol. ii., pp. 249, 250. Edit. 1769.) "This real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, his Church hath always believed. But the monstrous notion of his bodily Presence was started 700 years after his death." (Ibid. p. 251.)

So also Waterland:—"The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not *substantially,* and *corporally,* but *verily* and *indeed,* that is, *effectually.* The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent: but the *force,* the *grace,* the *virtue,* and *benefit* of Christ's *body broken, and blood shed,* that is of *his passion,* are really and effectually *present* with all them that receive worthily. This is *all the* REAL *presence our Church teaches.* . . . The *eating* his flesh and *drinking* his blood, mean having a part in that atonement, being partakers of the *benefit* of Christ's *death and satisfaction.* By *this,* and this *only,* we live; without it we die. It is by our Lord's meritorious death and passion that men are saved, as many as are saved: and, were it not for that, no flesh could be saved." (Works, vol. iv., pp. 42, 43.)

See also Archbishop Wake in Gibson's Preservative, vol. x., p. 58, sqq.

A050293.1
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A NEW ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

PRICE **3s. 6d.** *NET (Postage 4d.)*

A MANUAL OF
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

By the Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A.

Trinity College, Cambridge; formerly Fellow and Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London

WITH A PREFATORY NOTE

BY THE

Very Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury

It has been the aim of the author that this History of the Church of England from the introduction of Christianity to Britain to the present day, should be written with a thoroughness and impartiality which has too often been absent from similar books.

It is the work of one who was in full sympathy with the Reformation, but who, both by learning and temperament, was averse from controversy, and whose retiring and scholarly life enabled him to exercise the quiet judgment of an historian on the life and the struggles of the past.

It is the fruit of the careful study of a lifetime, by a trained student who never rested content with the use of second-hand material. He always went direct to first-hand authorities, and frequently found his way behind the ordinary sources to stores of information previously undiscovered or unutilised.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

TWENTIETH THOUSAND.

ENGLISH CHURCH TEACHING
ON FAITH, LIFE, AND ORDER.

PRICE **1s.** *NET.*

CONTENTS.

Part I.—The Faith of the English Church.

By the Rev. Canon GIRDLESTONE, M.A., late Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

I.—The Rule of Christian Faith.
II.—The Christian Faith.
III.—Leading Truths of Scripture.
IV.—Rome and England.

Part II.—The Life of the English Church.

By the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Durham.

I.—The Covenants explained and contrasted.
II.—The Ten Commandments.
III.—Worship and Prayer. The Prayer Book, The Lord's Prayer.
IV.—The Holy Sacraments.
V.—Holy Baptism.
VI.—Holy Communion.
Appendix on Evening Communion, Non-Communicating Attendance and Fasting Communion.
VII.—Aids to a Christian Life.

Part III.—The Order of the English Church.

By the Right Rev. T. W. DRURY, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man.

I.—The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.
II.—The Church as a Visible Society.
III.—The Church in its Order.
IV.—The Threefold Ministry.
V.—The Historic Episcopate.
VI.—The Church in its Unity.
VII.—Conspectus of Church History.

Part IV.—Brief Notes on some Texts which are frequently misinterpreted or misapplied.

Analytical Index.

By the Rev. Canon GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

BX
5149
.C5
D56
1911
V.1

Dimock, Nathaniel, 1825-1909.
Papers on the doctrine of the E
church concerning the Eucharistic
presence / by the Rev. N. Dimock.
Memorial ed. -- London : Longmans
Green & Co., 1911.
2 v. ; 20 cm.
Includes bibliographical refere
and index.

1. Lord's Supper--Church of En
I. Title: Doctrine of the Englis
church concerning the Eucharistic
presence.

A050293.1